OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
JAN 29 1929
LIBRARY

Rel. 1

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

A Journal of Religion

THE UNITED STATES RENOUNCES WAR

Fifteen Cents a Copy—January 31, 1929—Four Dollars a Year

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

January 31, 1929

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON, *Editor*
PAUL HUTCHINSON, *Managing Editor*
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON, *Literary Editor*

Contributing Editors

HERBERT L. WILLETT
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH
ALVA W. TAYLOR
REINHOLD NIEBUHR
JOSEPH FORT NEWTON
THOMAS CURTIS CLARK
FRED EASTMAN

Staff Correspondents

JOHN RAY EWERS
ERNEST THOMAS
CHARLES T. HOLMAN
EDGAR DEWITT JONES
E. TALLMADGE ROOT
A. A. HEIST
FRANCIS P. MILLER
JOSEPH MARTIN DAWSON
HUGH J. WILLIAMS
EDWARD SHILLITO
ERNEST W. MANDEVILLE
GEORGE B. WINTON
JOSEPH MYERS
EDWARD LAIRD MILLS
WILLIAM S. ABERNETHY
WILLIAM P. LEMON
P. O. PHILIP
T. T. BRUMBAUGH

Entered as second-class matter February 28, 1902, at Chicago, Ill., under the act of March 3, 1879. Published weekly by the Christian Century Press, 440 South Dearborn Street, Chicago.

$4.00 a year (ministers, $3.00). Canadian postage, 52 cents extra; foreign postage, $1.04 extra.

The Christian Century is indexed in the International Index to Periodicals generally found in the larger public libraries.

Contents

Editorial

Editorial Paragraphs....131
The United States Renounces War....134
Mr. Ford Employs More Men....136
Safed the Sage: Excuses and Accusations....137

Verse

Embryo, by John L. Davis....137

Contributed Articles

Have the Scientists Done a Better Job? by William E. Dodd....138
How Russia Makes Chinese Reds, by Jerome Davis....141

Books....143

Correspondence....144

The Debate on the Pact

On January 3, 1929....145
On January 4, 1929....153
On January 15, 1929....167

News of the Christian World

British Table Talk....173
Foreign Missions Conference in Hesitant Session..174
Students of Britain Think Together at Liverpool.175
Special Correspondence from Canada....176
Special Correspondence from Kentucky....178
Correspondence from the Pacific Northwest....180

Diamonds in a Gold Mine

Almost every line in this issue of The Christian Century is calculated to provoke comment or reflection. Since the importance of much of this material is so obvious as to make its neglect unthinkable, I want to use this column to point to two or three pages that might possibly be overlooked.

Mr. Shillito contributes twice this week, and both contributions contain quotations equal in importance to many a book that I have read. In his regular British Table Talk Mr. Shillito gives us the stimulating comment made by Principal Jacks on the danger which leisure and surplus wealth bring to people with empty minds. That, I imagine, is an American even more than a British problem.

But it is the word which the new archbishop of York spoke to the British students at their Liverpool convention that most stirs me. The archbishop was talking about the necessity for freedom of thought; freedom of research; all that sort of thing that is said so often and so unthinkingly. Then he thought of the charge that is often made that such freedom may lead to a loss of faith. His reply seems to me one of the most daring, and yet most fundamentally Christian, words that has come from a great prelate in many a long year. Read it for yourself, and see if you don't feel the same way about it!

Mr. Lacy's account of the Foreign Missions conference deserves thoughtful attention. Evidently, as a missionary, he is somewhat impatient with the way in which mission policies are discussed over here. And he says that the effective mission speeches are being made by men who are not connected, formally, with the missionary enterprise.

All Americans who have wondered at the fail- ure of the recent conference between Canadian and American officials to accomplish anything to lessen the flow of liquor over our northern border will do well to read what Dr. Thomas has to say about that situation. It will still seem to many of us a pity that the two governments cannot cooperate more effectively than they do in this regard, for Dr. Thomas makes it plain that the rum-runner is doing as much to undermine the laws of Canada as of the United States. But at least this will help us to catch the Canadian point of view.

THE FIRST READER.

Contributors to This Issue

WILLIAM E. DODD, professor of American history, University of Chicago; editor and joint author of the "Riverside History of the United States," etc. The present article, which consists of parts of an address delivered by Prof. Dodd before a conference held at the Chicago theological seminary, is printed by permission of the editor of the Chicago Theological Seminary Register.

JEROME DAVIS, professor of practical philanthropy, Yale divinity school; author, "The Russian Immigrant," etc.

CARLETON LACY, general agent for China of the American Bible society; now on furlough in this country.

The CHRISTIAN CENTURY

An Undenominational Journal of Religion

LUME XLVI | CHICAGO, JANUARY 31, 1929 | NUMBER 5

EDITORIAL

TO SIGNALIZE the senate's ratification of the treaty outlawing war, The Christian Century, after canvassing a score of suggestions, found ne so appropriate and satisfying as the simple de- e of publishing the complete record of the first two days of the debate on the peace pact, together with a large part of the record of the last day's discussion. We s lay before our readers the major contributions Senator Borah and Senator Thomas J. Walsh. cept for an able address delivered by Senator rtridge of California, which we regret we have space to include in this issue, the remainder of eleven day debate added little to the discussion. In colloquies with Senators Borah and Walsh, the ics of the treaty indicate with sufficient clearness views to which they only gave ampler expression their set speeches. In giving the full text of the ential portion of the debate we believe that we are only contributing to a better understanding of the aty, but providing our readers with a most fas- ating story.

e Essence of the nate Debate

e Crisis in the lvation Army

THE SOLICITOUS SYMPATHY of all Chris- tians must be with the Salvation Army in this ting hour. By an overwhelming vote the high coun- has declared General Bramwell Booth unfit to ex- ise longer the powers of his office. While a court unction has been secured by representatives of the osed general to make impossible further action by council, it is obvious that the leading officers who mpose this body are but waiting for the lifting of legal bar to elect some other person to the army's reme command. The situation is fraught with rmous peril to the most colorful, and in many pects the most effective, religious organization ught forth during the nineteenth century. The oths have ever been determined men and women. e "old general" and his wife built the army in the e of an opposition that would have daunted any iron-willed souls. Once their organization was nded, they ruled it with a rod of iron. Americans will not forget the discipline which descended on Ballington Booth when he rebelled at what he considered to be the arbitrary orders of his father. Now the same determined family is involved in another struggle, with Booths on both sides. Larger than any family issue grows the question as to the entire basis of army command. Is it to be a personal inheritance, passed on by individuals from generation to generation? Or is the army itself to have some voice in the choice of commander? It now looks as though the decision will be rendered finally by the British courts. Vast property interests will be at stake. But they should have slight weight in view of the spiritual loss which the kingdom of God is in peril of suffering.

Public Opinion Rises to Oppose the Cruiser Bill

AS the vice-president announced the ratification of the pact of Paris, an honorable senator arose to inquire as to the next business before the upper house. And the next business proved to be the cruiser bill. That bill continues to be unfinished business. It is hard to discover just how many senators are against it, or who its opponents are. Yet the bill's chief advocates are growing more and more uneasy as the days pass and the bill doesn't. For with the passage of each day, public opposition to this sort of expenditure of national funds is piling up. The American people are learning some things, and they are thinking others. They are learning, for example, that there are already eight new cruisers now under construction. They are learning, for another thing, that the present bill flouts the desires of the administration at a vital point, when it makes the construction of five new cruisers a year for the next three years mandatory, rather than permissible, as President Coolidge has recommended. They are learning, for still another thing, that the provision which the house of representatives wrote into the bill, requiring that at least half the new warships be built in government yards, has mysteriously disappeared from the measure now before the senate, so that, if passed, this bill will allow the secretary of the navy to allot this entire $274,000,000 to private shipyards. And in addition to these facts which they are learning, the American

people are thinking. They are thinking about that peace treaty which their government, to their great joy, has just ratified. They are thinking about the necessity for proving to the world that America has signed without her fingers crossed; that people and government are one in their desire to give the treaty that weight of public support which will establish its authority. And they are thinking about the psychological effect of following such a treaty ratification with a big cruiser building program. The longer they think the less they like the proposal. So the protests begin to pile up in Washington. That's why the bill's supporters want an immediate vote.

President Little Resigns At Michigan

THE RESIGNATION of Dr. Clarence C. Little, president of the University of Michigan, marks the culmination of a series of tensions which began to develop soon after he assumed the duties of his office three years ago. The way of the university president is hard at best. He has many people to please. And when, as in this case, he is more anxious to say what he thinks is true and do what he thinks is right than to please any of them, there are always possibilities of disruption. The antagonisms at Ann Arbor were chiefly two. They concerned the president's outspoken sentiments in regard to birth control and his policies with reference to student discipline and morals. The first alarmed the trustees, the second antagonized a large element among the students and the younger alumni. As a biologist and a student of eugenics, Dr. Little has for several years been an advocate of birth control. This provoked the opposition of the Catholics and some others and aroused the fears of the trustees that he would not be able to get the desired appropriations from the legislature for the university. This was a serious matter, for the first qualification of a successful president of a state university is to get appropriations. In an effort to eliminate some disintegrating influences in student life, Dr. Little sponsored the policy of forbidding students to have automobiles. It requires little imagination to know with what complete absence of enthusiasm such a regulation would be received by those directly affected.

When the College President Refuses to Truckle

WHEN the liquor situation among the student body grew serious—though probably no more serious than elsewhere, and he did not charge that it was—he called on the civil authorities, declaring that it was the business of the police and not of the university officials to enforce the laws of the state and that he saw no reason why law-breaking students should be treated any differently from any other kind of law-breakers. This unsympathetic attitude toward that ancient illusion of students that they are entitled to some sort of benefit of clergy when they break the laws, was no passport to popularity for the president. And so, not being wholly dependent upon this particular job for either occupation or income, the president decided that he could be more usefully and pleasantly employed by returning to the field of scientific research to which he had already devoted several years. Popular or not, his stand has been deliberately taken and frankly expressed. He has neither shuffled nor compromised, and his letter of resignation shows a spirit wholly unembittered. If the students of the university learn from him, as well they may, how to deal honestly with a difficult situation and how to retire gracefully from an impossible one, they will be indebted to him for a notable contribution to their education.

Who Said Pants In Kabul?

OUR SYMPATHY goes to King Amanullah, late of Afghanistan and now of the rest of the world at large. His attempt to speed up the modernization of his kingdom has ended in his own abdication, followed by the abdication of the brother to whom he sought to turn over the reins of government, and the enthronement of a tribesman known as Bacha Sakao, or the water boy. Perhaps King Amanullah does not feel in great need of sympathy. He is safely out of Kabul; it won't be long before he may be expected to join the lodge of ex-monarchs who hold forth in Paris and Monte Carlo. And there is every reason to believe that the fate which has befallen the young monarch is more due to his own errors of judgment than to any other cause. If the king, after his return from Europe and Turkey, had not been in such a rush to transform the customs of his country, he might, by a gradual process, have brought to pass the reform measures which he favored. But the attempt to make Afghan tribesmen take to wearing pants, shaving, letting their women go about unveiled, and sending their children to public schools, all at a moment's notice, produced an almost inevitable upheaval. For the moment, reaction has the upper hand in Afghanistan, just as it had in China in 1898, when the dowager empress crushed the reforms of the unfortunate emperor Kwang Hsu. Yet Afghanistan cannot permanently live in the middle ages, any more than China could. Within a quarter of a century, it may safely be predicted, Afghanistan will be well on the way toward a place beside those two other "reformed" Islamic nations, Turkey and Persia.

Reestablishing the Papal State

PREMATURE REPORTS have, from time to time, indicated that the "Roman question" was on the point of settlement by the reestablishment of the temporal sovereignty of the pope over a small state. One such report asserted that the Christmas encyclical would contain an official announcement to that effect, but that proved without foundation. Later dispatches

indicate, apparently on good authority, that the negotiations, which have been proceeding with interruptions for several months and intermittently for years, have issued in the formulation of terms which are acceptable both to the government and to the vatican and that it remains only to have them approved by the pope and Mussolini. Doubtless substantial progress has been made toward an agreement, but if it still lacks the approval of "il duce" and the pope, it lacks what it most needs, for Mussolini is the government and the pope is the church—so far as this matter is concerned. The starting-point of all recent efforts to re-establish papal sovereignty is, as The Christian Century has repeatedly stated, the idea of creating a state so small that it would not deprive the kingdom of Italy of any appreciable amount of territory or give the pope any considerable amount of power as a civil ruler. But the comment of the New York World that "the crucial question is political rather than religious" is true only in a very limited sense. The motive of the fascisti government in seeking a settlement of this troublesome problem is political rather than religious. It desires to strengthen its position and enhance its prestige by securing the support of the church. But the avowed motive of the church is religious: it is the idea that the church cannot perform its spiritual functions unless it is absolutely free from control by any secular authority, that the church is the kind of institution that properly can and logically must exercise civil power and possess the kind and degree of independence which can come only with absolute sovereignty. Setting up a papal state is a very different matter from reviving the independence of, say, the duchy of Parma or any of the city-states which were merged into larger political units and ultimately into the united kingdom of Italy.

Serbia Accepts a Dictatorship

LOCAL CONDITIONS have in each case had much to do with the differing courses adopted, but it is hard not to emphasize the contrast between recent political developments in Rumania and Jugoslavia. In Rumania, the coming to power of the peasant party, led by the theological professor, Maniu, has brought a wave of reform and a new access of power to the cause of democracy in southeastern Europe. In Jugoslavia, the action of the king in proclaiming a dictatorship smashes the last semblance of popular participation in the government and sets up a despotism beside which that of Mussolini pales. The Serbian dictatorship is, in fact, to a considerable degree inspired by the Italian, and is an answer to it. King Alexander has grown more and more restive in the face of the mounting demands and provocations of Mussolini. Under parliamentary government, Jugoslavia has apparently found no way wherewith effectively to oppose the Italian pressure. By proclaiming an absolute dictatorship, with all political rights abolished, the king hopes to be able to whip his sprawling and inchoate realm into a solidified political (and military) unit, wherewith to stand toe to toe with Italy and be ready for any eventuality. The French press is enthusiastic over the dictatorship; the Italian press growls dangerously. To the outsider, interested neither in French nor Italian schemes on the continent, but only in the establishment of enduring peace, the new dictatorship must be regarded with fear. Serbian ambitions played so large a part in producing the cataclysm of 1914 that any return of saber rattling to that part of the Balkans is alarming.

Is This a Joke, Or Isn't It?

NICARAGUA, having conducted an election in a manner to satisfy our state department and the marines, is sending a minister to Washington. We are not sure of the precise diplomatic title which he will bear, but if ever modern diplomat deserved the title of "minister extraordinary," the gentleman who is soon to present his credentials at the white house is the man. His name is Juan Batista Sacasa. There may be Americans in whose minds the nouns awake no echoes. Others, however, will remember that when American intervention took place in Nicaragua in 1926 the first result was to drive from the country a vice-president who claimed to have succeeded, under the provisions of the Nicaraguan constitution, to the presidency, and to establish in his place a leader of an opposing faction who claimed to have been elected president by a special session of the Nicaraguan congress. The gentleman whom the marines thus helped to drive out of the country was Senor Sacasa. He is a member of the Nicaraguan liberal party. The gentleman whom the marines, at the cost of considerable bloodshed and more money, settled firmly in the presidential chair, Senor Diaz, was a conservative. When, at last, the principal purpose of the marine intervention turned out to be the holding of an honest election—and all parties admit that the election thus held was honest—the conservative candidates were defeated and the liberals returned to power. Now the new liberal president rewards Senor Sacasa for his sacrifices of the past with the comfortable and important post at Washington. It all sounds like a Gilbert and Sullivan joke. But who is the joke on?

Two Corrections

TWO serious typographical errors occurred in the previous issue of The Christian Century, January 24. In the first sentence of the opening editorial, "The Treaty is Ratified!" it is stated that the peace pact of Paris was "ratified with reservations." The statement, of course, should have been "ratified *without* reservations." The vote was given 81 to 1, and should have been 85 to 1.

The article by Wayne C. Williams, "Dry Democrats and a New Party," was erroneously credited to "Wayne C. Wheeler" on the cover page, in the table

of the contents and the "Contributors to This Issue" corner. Several thousand copies had been printed before these errors were detected and rectified.

The United States Renounces War

AT LAST, the government of the United States has set this nation in its true light in relation to the peace of the world. For nearly a decade, since the rejection of the covenant of the league, America's position has been an anomalous and embarrassing one. Up to the close of the war, our people were accustomed to regard themselves as outstripping all other peoples in willingness to take advance steps toward peace. In general, this leadership was freely accorded us by our European neighbors. But with the rejection of the league, which was offered to us as the peace usufruct of the war, America has been an object of worldwide criticism. This criticism from outside has been reinforced by sharp censure from many of our own citizens. For nearly a decade we have been hearing Uncle Sam berated for his selfish aloofness, his indifference to world welfare, his loss of idealism.

With the approaching end of the administration of Calvin Coolidge, all this has been changed. The United States government through the official leadership of Secretary Kellogg, backed by the President, prompted and counseled by Senator Borah, flung a challenging proposal to all nations, offering to renounce war as an instrument of settling international disputes and to bind itself to seek the settlement of such disputes, whatever their origin or nature might be, only by pacific means. This startling offer was made on December 28, 1927. A treaty embodying it was signed by fifteen governments in Paris on August 27, 1928. During subsequent months 61 of the 64 nations of the world have indicated their purpose to adhere to this treaty. And on January 15, 1929, the senate of the United States ratified the treaty by a vote of 85 to 1. The fate of the treaty in the senate has been the chief burden of anxiety among lovers of peace both in the United States and throughout the world. And now the senate has finally launched it, unimpaired by any reservation whatever, upon the new epoch in world relationships which the consummation of such a treaty will surely create.

This is not the moment to defend the United States for its refusal to join the league of nations. With the ratification of the treaty outlawing war the whole scene of international discussion has been shifted. The old controversy is water that has flowed over the dam. A new path has been opened up. The government of the United States has set its feet firmly on this path. The sense of companionship with other nations who will presently join us in ratifying the pledge of peace will surely induce a new psychology, a new mood, among all who journey thus together. The possibilities of cooperation are unlimited. Having found the direction in which the peace goal lies, and having taken the first step toward it, the next steps are bound to follow.

But all this is for the future. Before setting out on our journey, it is well to consider where we now are. What did the senate do with the peace pact? Is it the same pact that Mr. Kellogg originally proposed, or was it mutilated and modified, as certain writers insist, as it went from one chancellery to another in the six months of diplomatic correspondence? Or did the senate weaken it so that nothing is left of its original character but a form of words? In these pages we have previously considered at sufficient length the question of the effect of the diplomatic correspondence upon the pact. We must now be content with a mere restatement of our conclusion: there is nothing in the entire range of the correspondence which modifies the treaty in any respect or beclouds the plain meaning of its simple terms—save at one point, namely, the statement in the British correspondence calling attention to "certain regions" in which Great Britain "has a special and vital interest." All the other questions with which the correspondence dealt were settled to the satisfaction of all by the application of law or common sense, and in no case by setting forth a reservation or any sort of qualification of the treaty's text.

The treaty thus came to the senate unimpaired by any reservations, except for the ambiguity in Great Britain's statement. Did Britain mean to say that she would not renounce war as an instrument of her policy in the "certain regions" to which Sir Austen Chamberlain's note referred? That would, of course, be a genuine reservation, fatal to the effectiveness of the treaty. Or did Britain mean simply to call attention to the fact that the boundaries of her empire were not merely the geographical boundaries of her territory but included certain special interests (one thinks, for example, of the Suez canal) vital to the peace and safety of the empire, an attack upon which would be repelled by her as a measure of self-defense? If this was Sir Austen's meaning it obviously implied no reservation at all. But his language is susceptible of either interpretation.

Senator Borah chose to take the latter interpretation as the true intent of the British government. In doing so, he probably adopted the best strategy for the senate debate, but he thereby weakened the hand of the labor and liberal parties in Great Britain, both of whom are demanding that the tory government's so-called "reservation" be either nullified or clarified. It is a matter of profound regret that the British government, seeing the confusion into which its muddling statement threw the United States senate, did not respond to the generous attitude of Senator Borah and Mr. Kellogg and speak a clarifying word to indicate that it had no intention of limiting in any sense its renunciation of war as an instrument of its imperial

policy. Such a statement would have dispelled the cloud of ambiguity which surrounds the British signature and prevented the anti-British speeches of Reed, Blaine, Bingham and one or two other senators from being uttered.

The Christian Century believes that Sir Austen did not intend in his correspondence to qualify his government's renunciation of war, and we repeat the assertion confidently made in these pages more than once, that the British people will, in their own time and their own way, see to it that an authoritative statement is made disavowing any purpose to qualify their pledge renouncing war as an instrument of Britain's policy.

What, then, did the senate do to the treaty? The senate ratified it without reservation, clearly, definitely and unambiguously. The treaty which the senate ratified is the same treaty that Mr. Kellogg first proposed. It suffered not the slightest impairment at the senate's hands. It would have been ratified within two days had not certain senators gagged at the British note. Nothing else caused serious trouble. Senator Borah argued that Great Britain gained nothing by calling attention to her regions of special and vital interest, that she was entitled to define her sovereignty for herself, and to defend her sovereignty as thus defined. But even though the argument was convincing, the fact remained that Britain had taken the pains to state her "Monroe doctrine." Why then should not the senate restate America's Monroe doctrine?

The device by which the opposing points of view were reconciled was the inclusion in the report of the committee on foreign relations of a statement redeclaring the Monroe doctrine, affirming the right of self-defense, and disavowing any obligation under the treaty to go to war against a violator of the treaty. This statement was written by Senator Borah, with the intention of offering it early in the debate. It had the approval of Secretary Kellogg. But Senator Borah would not offer it until the opposition agreed that no motion would be made to adopt it by a vote of the senate. When finally it was offered, it was merely filed, without being adopted.

The committee's report changes nothing, reserves nothing, effects nothing—so far as this treaty is concerned. The right of self-defense is declared to be inherent in every treaty and inalienable. It should be noted that it is not "defensive war" that is declared to be inherent in the treaty, but the *right* of self-defense. The *institution* of war—without distinction as to *kinds* of war, whether "defensive" or "aggressive," is condemned, and its use for the settlement of disputes is renounced. Self-defense, of course, is not an institution; it is a *right,* a principle, which no law or treaty can touch. A treaty renouncing war neither involves nor affects it.

The Monroe doctrine is reaffirmed. It is defined as a measure of self-defense, and only as such a measure. It points altogether towards Europe; not at all towards our Latin American neighbors. Under the definition which Senator Borah got his committee to approve, the doctrine is freed from all the imperialistic implications with which it has been invested since Mr. Roosevelt's presidency. This is an invaluable by-product of the senate debate, but what chiefly concerns us at the moment is the fact that there is no reservation of the Monroe doctrine from the operation of the pact. A statement *reaffirming* the Monroe doctrine is quite different from a statement *reserving* the Monroe doctrine from the renunciation of war. In renouncing war, no nation is required to renounce any policy; it renounces war as an *instrument* of *every* policy. The senate made no reservation of war as an instrument of the Monroe doctrine. It merely reaffirmed the Monroe doctrine; and in ratifying the treaty it agreed never to seek the settlement of any dispute arising under the Monroe doctrine (". . . all disputes, whatever their origin or nature may be") except by pacific means.

The renunciation of war as an instrument of our national policy is thus complete and absolute. The treaty has passed through its most hazardous and fateful stages. There can be no question as to its ratification by other parliaments. And, except for the cloud on Great Britain's signature, it remains absolutely intact as originally offered by Mr. Kellogg.

One of our motives in setting forth the essential portion of the senate debate in our pages this week is to exhibit the masterly grasp by Senators Borah and Walsh of the philosophy underlying the peace pact. These two men stood like giants, head and shoulders above their colleagues, when it came to the discussion of international affairs. To their legal learning they added insight, and these two spell statesmanship. One of the neatest episodes of the debate was that in which Senator Walsh pointed out the difference between an anti-war treaty and the arbitration treaties in which the Monroe doctrine and other specified types of dispute are reserved. Under the arbitration treaties the United States agrees to arbitrate every dispute except those specifically reserved. Under the treaty outlawing war the United States agrees that whether a given dispute is arbitrable—according to the arbitration treaty—or not, *we will not seek to settle it by war.*

But in thus singling out these two senators and their masterly interpretations of the treaty, there is a peril as well as a benefit. Their interpretation has no official status whatsoever. It is worth only what it is worth on its merits. No reader should follow, for example, Senator Borah's answers to questions with uncritical respect for all his replies. They are not infallible. They may not be precisely, in every case, the same replies that Mr. Borah would himself give were he allowed more time to formulate his opinions. What, for instance, would have been the effect of the treaty had it been in existence before the Spanish war, is wholly conjectural. The reader has a perfect right to differ from Senator Borah's replies. Our

contention is that all such questions are vain and unanswerable. History cannot be turned inside out. A factor which did not arise within a given situation cannot be injected into that situation in such a fashion as to justify any calculation of its effects. There was no peace pact in 1898, nor in 1914. There is a peace pact in 1929. It has arisen within the world situation of 1929. Its potencies for good derive from the fact that it is integral to the mood, the experience, the moral insight, the economic condition, the international intimacies, the scientific development of modern warfare—and innumerable other facts which together constitute the civilization of 1929. What its effects shall be is for those who live in this day and in this civilization to determine for themselves.

Mr. Ford Employs More Men

IN THE CLOSING DAYS of 1928 the Ford motor company published a carefully worded notice in which it announced that it would employ thirty thousand additional men. In order to prevent the army of the jobless from descending upon Detroit the notice declared that Detroit men would be given preference in the employment lines. Of course the word "preference" left a glimpse of hope to the luckless men who do not live in the motor capital but are in need of a job. Perhaps the word was carefully chosen. It is easier to pick good material if the choice is large. At any rate, the choice *was* large.

The notice was barely printed before a cavalcade of second-hand automobiles from every part of the middle west was on its way to Detroit. On the first day after the New Year's holiday six thousand men took their places in the employment lines. Automobiles from every contiguous state were parked in the neighborhood. There they stood in the cold and ice, a veritable army of wistful and eager men. One could not survey them without a sense of tragedy. How many were fighting for a job in order that wife and child might be protected from the winter's cold? How many had foolishly left a good job because the magic name of Ford still summons visions of fabulously high wages? Did they not know that they were fighting for jobs which will bring $25 per week, five days at five dollars? They must have known that, for the newspaper stories were fairly clear as to that point. Perhaps they were coming from jobs which paid less than such a minimum sum. More probably they had held no job at all.

Look at such a line of tragedy, and what do you see? That young fellow there, beating his hands to keep them warm, seems too intelligent to be lost among the jobless. Why didn't he learn tool making or die making and graduate into the aristocracy of the skilled laborers? He probably started running an automatic machine as soon as he finished school. The wages seemed fairly good, so he didn't bother to learn a trade. Now he belongs to the millions who are the slaves of the machines. The machines have the skill, not they. When the machines stop they are on the street looking for a job. Look at that old man trying to hold his place in the line against the shoving striplings! The poor fellow doesn't realize that he hasn't a chance in the world to get a job. There are men here much younger than he who have no better chance. Why should the employment office take on anybody over 45 when so many young men are to be had whose stamina serves the automatic machine so much better than the experience of age? The modern machine requires no experience. It demands only raw strength . . . . and soon uses it up.

One looks at that eager crowd and ponders many things past and present. Was slavery really so bad? It guaranteed bed and board, and a degree of protection in old age. The machine guarantees nothing. You work today and are fired tomorrow. You are on the street with nothing to sell except your two hands and a strong back. The chances are that most of those fellows in line had a great time in the last presidential campaign. They probably got excited about Al Smith and a glass of beer. But what difference does it make who is President when you are subjected to the indignity of begging for a right that ought to be taken for granted, the right to work? And wouldn't bread be better than beer? Where are all those men going to sleep tonight? The flop houses and the missions will be filled to overflowing. The charities of the city will have to work overtime taking care of those who are stranded.

"Jack and I had twelve dollars between us," one overhears. "We spent six for gas and three for grub. The rest will have to do us this week." Wasn't it said that Mr. Ford didn't give anything to the Detroit community chest this year? He returned to his original dogma, disavowed for a year or two, that an "adequate wage" obviates the necessity for "philanthropy." That old, haunting question bobs up again: Is Mr. Ford a shrewd and cruel schemer or is he just incredibly naive in dealing with the social facts of modern industry? One still inclines to the opinion that naivete rather than shrewdness characterizes most of his attitudes. But it is a convenient ignorance. And it gives his hardboiled underlings plenty of liberty of action.

The hour is growing late and no effort is made to pass on all the men. A total of six hundred are finally arbitrarily chosen. Perhaps it isn't so arbitrary, after all. It looks as if those employment men have their eyes out for young blood. The office is finally closed and those who are left out mill about in the winter's cold, their listless eyes reminding one of Markham's phrase about "the emptiness of ages in his face." Tomorrow will see another chapter in the same tragedy. Tomorrow some of the men will come in the middle of the night so that they may find positions of vantage. Is there no one among the city's well clothed multitudes who can appreciate the tragic beauty of this kind of heroic effort? There is sullen-

ness here, but no rebellion; none of those qualities that are supposed to imperil civilization. There is nothing but heroic patience, worthy of a better civilization.

Perhaps one ought not be so sensitive about this spectacle. Mr. Ford is providing work for the unemployed. Is not his five day week creating opportunities for thirty thousand men who would be subject to charity if he permitted the pressure of orders to destroy the five day week for a six day schedule? We are told that the factory will run on a six day schedule but with each man working only five days. That is the scheme that gained all the newspaper publicity. There are some advantages in the plan. The automatic machine is creating a problem of permanent unemployment. This may be a method of solution.

But alas, even this consolation is premature. Back in the city, one mingles among Ford workers and hears ugly rumors that men are being fired by the wholesale. "This is just a scheme," declare the workers, "for replacing seven dollar men with five dollar men. They call it 'weeding out the inefficient'." There is no way of finding out how general the dismissals are. A few are checked up and they tell their story. There is no question but that the old policy which gave the Ford worker fair security in the possession of his job is gone. Men are being fired. Whether the dismissals are as wholesale as the men insist cannot be determined. It would be necessary to visit hundreds of homes before one could be sure. But it does seem fairly certain that there will not be a net increase of thirty thousand men in the Ford plants.

Old men are giving way to young men and high wages to lower wages. The keen competition in the automotive industry makes that a fairly general policy. Labor prices are about all that the companies can bargain with in determining costs. So men are dismissed and new men are hired at lower wages. Only Mr. Ford is able to do it amid the general approbation of his countrymen. Perhaps he has a better publicity department, or perhaps the public is simply loath to destroy its heroes. Outside of Detroit Mr. Ford is a hero. What does it matter what his labor policy is? We must have cheap automobiles and we must have our mythology. Supermen of the machine cast in the role of spiritual heroes by the current mythology, cheap automobiles and an army of unemployed—if that does not sum up our civilization it describes a considerable part of it.

Excuses and Accusations

A Parable of Safed the Sage

NOW there dwelt in the City where I lived a man whom I knew, and so far as I was aware he was All Right. For while I had never heard anything Very Good about him, neither had I heard anything bad, and I was not looking for it. And he was married, and so far as I knew his Marriage was an happy one. And there was in that City a woman, and of her I knew nothing that was wrong, and I was not expecting to learn of it. And it came to pass of an evening that I ate my Dinner in a Restaurant, and I beheld this man and this woman eating there together. And I bade them Good Evening and went on about my Business, and forgot it.

And the next day did the man call upon me, and explain to me that this lady was a neighbor, and that her husband was a good friend of his, and was out of town, and that his own wife also was out of town, and that they had clubbed their loneliness and taken dinner together. And I thought that was All Right and said so.

And a day or two later I met the lady, and she took pains to tell me that her meeting with this neighbor was All Right.

And by that time I was Growing Suspicious.

And afterward, I chanced to meet them both together, and they made Earnest Haste to Explain to me just how it happened, and by that time I was Pretty Certain that something was Wrong.

Now I might have seen these two friends and neighbors together Twice or Twenty Times and have thought no evil of it, but when they began to Explain, then did I begin to Suspect.

There was a Famous Professor in Oxford, which is in England, and he said, Never explain; never retract; never apologize: get it done and Let Them Howl.

And I do not altogether advocate that method, either; but even that is better than too much explanation.

For Explanation is Often Self-accusation; and it setteth people to wondering why an Explanation was deemed necessary, if everything was right.

Wherefore, beloved, do thou endeavor so to live so that it will not be necessary to Explain too many things; for if thy reputation is good, people are more likely to trust thy Conduct than to accept thine Explanation.

And I might remark in closing, that I learned in time why the two people I have been telling about thought it necessary to explain.

Embryo

LORD, be not impatient with me
For mine infidelity:
Thou art Just and Good;
While base iniquity
In me doth brood.

But Lord—
Thy Pardon I implore,
Thou hast lived ten million years—
I, but twenty-four.

JOHN L. DAVIS.

Have the Scientists Done a Better Job?

By William E. Dodd

IT IS my purpose here to re-emphasize the contributions of the earnest, if only semi-literate, preachers and laymen who busied themselves day and night a hundred years ago in the vast region then called the west, busied themselves in the work of "saving men's souls from the 'everlasting burning.'"

To make our story clear, it is necessary to assess the raw material of the region which stretched from the eastern ridges of the Alleghenies to the Mississippi. At the fall of Napoleon the west was a dense wilderness broken in its upper reaches by the rolling prairie. Into this wilderness there had come the poorest of the eastern communities, carrying their possessions on their backs or on pushcarts, now and then on horseback. With these, in proportion of about one to three, there were Scotchmen, Irishmen, and Germans, the tang of the foreigner noticeable in their speech and behavior. Both the older American settlers and the new arrivals from Europe were themselves peasants or descendants of peasants, their strongest motive the possession of a tract of land and a home for themselves and children. Their dim past told them of a thousand years of subordination and oppression, of poor food, of labor on the manors of their lords, and of dirty cottages with straw-covered floors and leaky roofs.

The Touch of Freedom

In the wilderness they felt the magic touch of freedom and the dignity of land-ownership. They were new men, talking of liberty. But they were still ignorant, perhaps a fourth of them able to read their own names in print. Ignorance is first-cousin to superstition; and the westerners brought their ghosts from the dark castles of Europe to the mysterious wilderness that knew no bounds. Here the terrific cyclones which swept great swaths of the forest before them, or the terrible river floods that carried away trees and cabins alike, were the work of strange powers. If the moon carried a wide, reddish ring about it, there was to be a disastrous storm; if the sun went down wrong, there was evil to come. The cows were bewitched in the forest and the milk was therefore poison to the baby. Corn must be planted when the moon was new and growing. If a cock crowed after sunset, there would be a death in the family. Life was shot through with fears and superstitions; the better-educated as well as the stupid were under the spell of spirits and signs; the inheritance of ancient Europe qualified by the uncertainties and the dangers of a boundless wilderness and an awesome nature running to contrasts: extremes of heat in summer and of cold in winter.

Into this wide expanse there came, about the time of the terrible deflation which followed the Napoleonic debacle at Waterloo, lean, sinewy, half-literate preachers, on foot or horseback, poorly clad, without scrip or purse, and with tears in their eyes, proclaiming a solemn call, a warning that men should "flee the wrath to come." One of the first was the thin, ascetic James McGreary, from North Carolina, an educated man possessed with the terrible fear that all men were about to slip into a fearful hell. Great throngs of people gathered about the little log churches that had been built in the more developed parts of Kentucky. His language was marvelous and his word-pictures horrible:

> An unregenerate "died accursed of God, when his soul was separated from his body and the black flaming vultures of hell began to encircle him on every side. Then all the horrid crimes of his past stared him in the face; the remembrance of misimproved sermons and sacramental occasions flashed like streams of forked lightning through his tortured soul; the reflection that he had slighted the mercy of God was like a poisoned arrow piercing his soul. When the fiends of hell dragged him into the eternal gulf, he roared and screamed and yelled like a devil. Indians, pagans, and Mohammedans stood amazed and upbraided him, falling like Lucifer from the meridian blaze of the gospel and threshold of heaven, sinking into the liquid, boiling waves of hell and the accursed sinners of Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah sprang to the right and left and made way for him to pass them and fall lower down, even to the deepest cavern in the flaming abyss. Here his conscience like a never dying worm stings him and forever gnaws his soul."

Peter Cartwright, stout and resolute, likewise brought the Methodist gospel into the wilderness, prayed in men's houses against the protests of wicked and unrepentant parents, prayed and argued till he had father, mother, and children on their knees and begging to be saved from the flames of a hell that yawned to receive them. He held open-air meetings, built little churches, created circuits, and traveled them from year to year. The nature of his work and of the people may be guessed from one of his encounters in an outdoor meeting:

> One of them made a pass at my head with his whip, but I closed in with him and jerked him off his seat. A regular scuffle ensued. I threw my prisoner down; he tried to get loose. The mob rose and rushed to the rescue. An old, drunken magistrate came up to me and ordered me to let my prisoner go. He swore he would knock me down. I told him to crack away. One of my friends took my prisoner, and the drunken magistrate made a pass at me. I parried the stroke and seized him by the collar and the hair of the head and brought him to the ground. . . .On Sunday, when we had vanquished the mob, the whole encampment was filled with mourning. . . . The encampment was lighted, the trumpet was blown and I rose in the stand and required every soul to come into the congregation. . . . My voice was strong and clear and my text was: The gates of hell shall not prevail. In thirty minutes the power of God fell on the congregation and the people fell in every direction, not less than three hundred fell like dead men in mighty battle; loud wailings went up to heaven from sinners, and a general shout from Christians, so that the noise was heard afar off. Our meeting lasted all night, and Monday and Monday night; and there were two hundred that professed religion.

There were scores of such preachers, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist, circuit-riders and their kind who were so famous that thousands, even tens of thousands of people gathered in camp meetings to hear them warn men, beg them to be saved and to enroll themselves in church organizations—the only sure way to salvation. A very few of them were what we would call educated. Of the one hundred and fifty-five clergymen in Illinois in the year 1827, one-half found it difficult to read unfamiliar passages in well-known books. In Ohio there were one hundred and thirty ministers, only three or four of whom were counted learned in the then accepted sense of learning.

These facts are mentioned, not to disparage or ridicule the work that was done all over the west in the time of Abraham Lincoln, but to emphasize its effectiveness. A more highly trained ministry would not have succeeded, as was shown more than once when the Congregational and Episcopalian churches sent out college-trained clergy.

Pointed Preaching

The preacher was simple and direct in manner. He rarely employed words of more than one or two syllables. He believed all he said and himself trembled with emotion as he described his everlasting hell; his countenance lighted up when he pictured the sensuous joys of the heaven with golden streets and gates of pure pearl; and on critical occasions he worked miracles after the manner of the New Testament narratives. He wept with his scores of penitents prostrate on the ground before him; he rarely failed to find a way for all to everlasting salvation. And he connected his hell and heaven, his future state of rewards and punishments, with the practical affairs of this life. A convert was at once a better citizen. He could not think of an orderly world without a conviction that all evildoers must be forever punished in the world to come. And, likewise, all who did well in this vale of tears must inevitably receive the final plaudit: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

The sermons were long and doubtless dreary on hot August days, dreary to those who were not "awakened." The songs were of that earnest, fearful kind which the pious John Newton and William Cowper wrote in matchless words and meters. "Rock of Ages" or "God Moves in a Mysterious Way His Wonders to Perform," read off two lines at a time and sung by great congregations, spread over an acre of ground, made a great impression—these and a score of other moving hymns made appeal to the masses of people which the present generation can hardly understand. Nor were the preachers fit only for sermons and songs. They visited the people in their cabins; reprimanded surly husbands or cantankerous wives when they would. They ate the common fare of poor farmers, slept in beds not without vermin to pester at night, and taught the people to keep their houses clean and to put in new furniture when good luck or a new canal brought money into the family chest. And over all these preachers, with none too much of culture, were certain leaders and religious statesmen: Francis Asbury among the Methodists; a Hoge or a Breckinridge among the Presbyterians; and John M. Peck of the Baptists—leaders and guides who tempered and disciplined their fellows and set standards for the people.

And the result was that in a single generation the scattered, illiterate, and superstitious population of 1815 was fairly remolded. In spite of differences, it was a Calvinist creed that all professed or feared. And as the population increased and wealth began to accumulate in certain neighborhoods and growing centers of trade, the older—or, at any rate, more-developed—churches of the east found a footing, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Roman Catholics, giving the region the aspect of modern America. In a region where few people had held contact with any religious organization in the beginning, there were by 1850-60 powerful churches and seating accommodations for pretty nearly the whole population. If men were not communicants, they accepted more or less the tenets and the dogmas of the democratic churches, looked upon life as a very serious business, felt the urge of religious order; and all were firmly convinced that an awful fate awaited him who passed away without making peace with God, fit preparation of the masses of the people for that scourge of war that was so soon to break upon them.

II.

But another and an equally effective change was wrought directly and indirectly by the earnest and prayerful preachers who accompanied McGready and Asbury, Cartwright and Peck. Historians have been accustomed to think that Jefferson's evangelical injunction in the Northwest ordinance, "the education of all the people at public cost," became effective because it was written into law. The sixteenth section of land in every township was dedicated to popular education, to be sure; but law does not enforce itself. And the territorial and later state legislatures simply ignored the injunction. They did not regularly set up schoolhouses. They forgot to reserve the sections, and they traded the good sections for bad sections in order to entice settlers or to accommodate land speculators. Thirty years after the ordinance was supposed to apply, a reliable witness reported that there were as good as no schools in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois; and as late as 1840 conditions were not much better. Schoolhouses were few and inadequate; teachers were hardly to be had; and parents did not choose to send their children to school.

It took many years to develop a public opinion in the west that compelled speculators and politicians to observe the famous ordinance and set up adequate

schools. The development of the requisite public opinion was in large measure the work of our traveling preachers. While Baptists and Methodists were slow to recognize the value of more education than merely enough to spell out the texts of the Bible and read aloud their stirring hymns, they did favor the improvement of the minds of their people; they believed in the three R's and in schools to impart that modicum of learning. And once people generally made use of the arts of reading and writing, the little newspaper came into existence—four pages of clear type, which announced the meetings of courts, advertised barbecues, spread notices of runaway apprentices, and, above all, carried stories of the triumphant deaths of saints, of the confessions of the wicked as they lay on their last beds, and of the shame of drunkenness. The preachers helped men to read, and reading created an expanding desire for knowledge. One has but to read the little sheets that circulated among the people to realize the influence of church and religious folk. And all confidently believed that the middle west must speedily wield the decisive influence of a great nation: "It is confidently believed that the west will shortly wield the destinies of the great nation. How important that they should be an intelligent and virtuous people."

Origin of Western Colleges

There were nuclei and centers of education, and even learning from which powerful influences radiated in all directions: Transylvania university, the germs of the state universities of Michigan and Indiana. Yet every one of these was directed by clergymen, and their leading teachers were strongly of the religious and denominational bent. Thus before the states were aroused as such to the Jeffersonian injunction, the preachers and their lay co-workers set the faces of the westerners toward a higher culture and prepared the people to appreciate the appeals of Horace Mann of Massachusetts and of Robert J. Breckinridge of Kentucky.

When the young folk were sufficiently advanced in the rudiments, they returned to the farms whence they had come, except those who proposed to teach in the schools or become preachers in the pulpits. For these latter, the older churchmen labored long and faithfully to build seminaries. Peter Cartwright, none too fond of "book-learning" or college preachers, persuaded his people to contribute pitiful sums to the first Methodist college of Illinois: a shilling from one, a day's work from another, and a load of corn or boards from still another. To build Franklin college, Indiana, children gave pennies, women gave the precious calico long laid away for new dresses, and men delivered bedsteads that could be spared from their homes to the dormitories of the college. Now and then an easterner, like Abbott Lawrence, sent a fabulous sum to endow some struggling denominational or missionary school, and stamped his name forever upon the map of the country.

The Struggle for Education

If there were serious doubts of the accepted Calvinist creed, the doubts did not reach the ears of the instructors. If men wondered now and then how the world could have been created in six short days and all the complicated business of life set going, they did not start controversies. The imminence of hell and everlasting damnation was too clear, and the call of a lost world too urgent. To enable young men to fight the good fight, literary societies were organized at every school, and students wrestled manfully with each other over grave subjects of theology, statecraft, and classic literature. Scientific museums were set up and students brought in arrowheads and the bones of strange men and animals found in mounds that were plowed down by their fathers. There was everywhere a keen intellectual interest, albeit the range was not great. Young men and parents sacrificed the very necessities of life to procure this needful education, and little money or time was wasted in the process. A professor's salary was five hundred, at most a thousand dollars; a president might receive as much as fifteen hundred dollars. Board or the materials of board cost a dollar or two dollars a week. A suit of clothes lasted two years. Traveling preacher-agents walked or rode on horseback over the counties of each state, preached in the churches, and begged collections from the people.

The process went on painfully and slowly till the middle of the century, when the results were plain and read of all men. Ohio Wesleyan and Denison universities, Hanover and Franklin colleges of Indiana, Illinois and Shurtleff colleges of middle Illinois, and schools of similar purpose and resources in Michigan and Wisconsin—all were open and busy with the great process of educating young ministers and laymen of the churches, setting higher and higher the levels of scholarship and culture for the people. The labors of the preachers were bringing forth fruit in abundance, they would have said; and the historian must grant their claim. The crude people, in the early days so often half or wholly drunk when they attended camp meetings, were now sober. In place of the widespread and pitiful ignorance of the days of the Cutlers of Ohio and the Edwardses of Illinois, there was in 1850 a general level of education and intellectual interest quite as high as that of Virginia or New York, if not of Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Growth of Community Order

And there was less of public swearing and rowdyism. Meetings were not disturbed, and political gatherings rarely broke up in fisticuffs. The lawless and unruly west of 1820 was ready in 1850 for the greatest and most searching debates since the days of the founders. And with these remarkable evidences

of the abiding success of the "carpenters and fishermen" of the earlier day, there grew apace a demand for a still soberer citizenship. One of Abraham Lincoln's early public lectures was aimed at the harmful habit of strong drink. The papers carried frequent warnings against the drink evil:

> 1, Drink inculcates falsehood; 2, it fixes bad habits; 3, it tends to pauperism and crime; 4, it diminishes the wealth of a nation; 5, it increases taxes; 6, it weakens the mind; 7, it impairs the health; 8, corrupts morals, shortens life, and ruins the soul.

John B. Gough, only another preacher, was already on his great circuit proclaiming the day of total abstinence; Henry Ward Beecher and Horace Greeley were abetting him in a cause that was far advanced when the war between the states gave a new drift to American history.

III.

The middle west was clothed and in her right mind, the work of humble, semi-literate traveling preachers who were then passing off the stage. The great community was fairly ready for its rôle in the direful conflict which was to upset the national constitution and revolutionize the country. Men had a faith—a harsh faith, to be sure. They believed that life on earth was but the beginning of an infinite life in a world that was unseen; that law and order here were but the beginnings of a more perfect state of law and order in a world to come; that there must be a God who overrules the affairs and lives of all men, a God of all power who yet declined to use that power, a God of infinite mercy who permitted the most unmerciful things to happen—a God of all wisdom and from everlasting to everlasting. A religion and a faith which permeated all society, if it did not govern all men's lives.

The time was fast approaching for a deeper and a more discriminating education, an education which accepts the Darwinian philosophy and opens to trained minds a vast new world, but which an Asbury or a Peck or a Wiley must have thought the work of the Evil One himself. The preachers had brought about a better state and a wiser, albeit a crude, social ideal. If they would make an end of the drink evil, they would also abandon the ancient slave system. It was an honest, a thorough work—a reform that could hardly be ridiculed as only "another reform." But their day was done. It was time for the raw, tobacco-chewing, psalm-singing, and semi-literate preacher to leave the stage he had made, the world laughing at him. Statesmen and scientists were in the offing. One wonders, as one reviews the story, whether the statesmen and the scientists have done a better job.

How Russia Makes Chinese Reds

By Jerome Davis

AMERICA has heard of the propaganda of the bolsheviks. It is very real and effective. Americans do not so often realize that the bolsheviks compare it with and justify it by the work of American missionaries. They declare that a program of justice for the working masses of the world is just as fundamental as the gospel of the prince of peace. This may seem like a gross caricature of reason to the western mind, and perhaps it is, but we should realize that the bolsheviks have taken over much of our western missionary technique in propagating their communism. Books, schools and doctors can be used to promote communism as well as Christianity. Today in Russia in place of church and prayer meeting stands a communist club, in place of a crucified God a martyred Lenin, and in place of a Bible—the gospel of Marx.

In some respects the communists have gone the Christian missionaries one better, or think they have. American missionaries have established universities in China. The bolsheviks have set up a Chinese university in the heart of Moscow. Really of all the institutions in Moscow—communistic, militaristic or economic—there is scarcely one more picturesque than "The University for the Laboring Masses of China in the Name of Sun Yat-sen." It faces the mammoth Cathedral of our Savior, almost an entire block of buildings given over entirely to the Chinese. Here are club rooms, dormitory accommodations for both men and women, class rooms, lecture halls, moving picture auditoriums and all the varied necessities of a modern university plant.

The whole idea was curiously enough first brought forward by the Russian "Society of Hands-off-China." They had over half a million members and began collecting money to offset what they held to be the dangerous advance of the capitalistic nations against the liberty and sovereignty of China. The government donated a former middle school of the tsar's regime and the buildings are even now being elaborately remodeled. The Russian trade unions have supported it, as has also the communist international, but the primary credit belongs to the society, which in order to keep "hands off" China, reached out their hands to China.

The university formally opened its doors in November, 1925, with a student body of 100 which by February, 1926, had risen to 300 and by the beginning of 1928 had 600. The students were selected by the central committee of the People's Party of

China (the Kuomingtang) and virtually only its members were eligible. Now the students come from the former communist wing of that organization which has been outlawed. The bulk of the students today come from the provinces of Kwangtung and Hunan. The intention was to accept only those who could speak a foreign language—English, French or German. Actually less than ten per cent came so equipped. Among this minority English was predominant.

Finding themselves flooded with a student body which spoke only Chinese, the administration was in difficulty. There were no available textbooks in Chinese, nor were interpreters available. The dilemma was solved by using the advanced ten per cent as interpreters for the rest. As a result, after one and one-half years of work many of these same Chinese are now themselves giving lectures. Naturally, most of this group had already received graduate training. Three had even finished courses at American universities.

Who Attends Such a School?

Originally tremendous competition developed in China for places at the school. In Canton alone 300 qualified students desired entry, although the allotment for that city was supposed to be only fifty. A clever scheme of elimination was finally used compelling all applicants in Canton to study Russian for one preliminary year. During this time so many were drafted into revolutionary work that there were only ninety left. From this number seventy-five were finally selected. Today there are not nearly so many candidates because the nationalist government opposes such training and it has thus become dangerous to study in Russia.

The average age of the entering students at first was 21, by the second year it had risen to 23 and they hope to have it reach 25. The majority now are graduates of Chinese middle schools, although fifteen per cent have either entered or graduated from a university.

During the two-year course, every student is given money sufficient to pay his expenses to and from China. In addition he receives free tuition, including everything needed in the way of technical equipment such as notebooks, textbooks, pencils and laboratory supplies. Besides free room and board there is a monthly stipend of fifteen roubles to cover incidentals. Men with families are not accepted. Since, however, fifteen per cent of the student body are women, some marriages have occurred. In fact, the Chinese population has already been increased by six children.

The students represent a variety of different social classes, including peasants, merchants and militarists, but the majority come from the intellectual classes. At least two of the prominent Chinese generals did have children there at one time, but with the changed political outlook at home they have returned to China.

The chief aim of the university is to share with the youth of China the fundamental guiding principles of communism and the experience of the "proletarian revolution." Here they should learn, for instance, the imperative necessity of a union between peasants and workers if any basic revolutionary movement is to be built. This the Russians feel is one of the great principles which have come from their Revolution.

Curriculum

The first year the student is introduced to communism through the following subjects: The Russian language; current events, reading the Russian newspapers; economic geography; political economy; a history of revolutions in the east and west; the Chinese revolutionary movement; and "History of the Growth of Society" (sociology). Each class comes three times a week and lasts one and one-half hours. Besides the regular classes there are laboratory trips to all the varied institutions of the city. These occupy at least four hours a week. Sometimes a class will concentrate for an entire month on a single factory, studying its life in almost every particular, especially the interrelation and function of the trade unions, of the communist party and of the soviet structure. It is thought this should be a great help in organizing similar work in China. Again the courts are studied until the work of the legal institution is thoroughly understood.

During the second year the students continue the studies named plus courses in "The Theory and Practice of the Russian Revolution" and in "The Philosophy of Current Historical Movements."

Eventually it is planned to have one teacher for every five students. At present, owing to the small number of those who know Chinese, the students are divided into larger groups, depending on their previous training. There is a great deal of freedom for individual work and not so much slavish copying of notes as in our American universities. Each student has the privilege of consulting with his instructor at any time. There are eight special rooms for this purpose where a teacher is on duty and special reference libraries are available.

Spreading Communism

In view of the language difficulties, it was finally decided to translate some of the Russian books into Chinese. Consequently a printing press has been set up and thirty interpreters are now at work assisting in the work of translation. Already 85 books in Chinese are available and from 500 to 1,000 copies of each have been printed.

Besides teaching the theory of communism, the school itself is a living demonstration of its principles. The students are completely organized and pay fifty kopeks (25 cents) a month in dues. On every commission appointed by the university authorities, the students have representation. The chief of these are

the commissions on sanitation; educational matters; library; economic (having charge of culinary arrangements, etc.), and the cultural. The last commission has charge of all the recreational activities, including moving pictures and theaters. Students are at liberty to form supplementary committees along any line of their interest. These range all the way from music and radio to athletics.

Every branch of science has an elected student secretary as does every single class. These men meet each week with the teachers and criticize or make suggestions regarding the work as it is given. Such weight is given their opinion that in economic geography, for instance, two teachers were dropped at the request of the students. They have also their own executive committee comprising the chairman and secretary of the students' organization as well as the chairman of each subordinate commission. The entire university is run by a council of six in which the students are represented and have one vote. The other members are the rector, vice-rector, secretary, and a representative from the teachers. Although limited to one vote, actually the students have much more power. According to the secretary, "After all, if the students are dissatisfied, intellectual achievement is hampered, so where possible we acceed to their wishes."

Vacation Experiences

The school year begins on September 5 and lasts nine and one-half months. During the summer vacation all the Chinese are sent to a mammoth "rest home" named after Kalinin, the president of the republic, some twenty miles outside Moscow. It covers an area several miles in circumference and provides accommodations for 2,000 workers from the trade unions of Moscow. Each worker can here take his two weeks' vacation free of charge. Although the Chinese have special quarters and eat in a special dining room they are not otherwise isolated. During their stay the camp has a turnover of about ten thousand, thus providing adequate opportunity for the Chinese to talk with a fair cross-section of the ordinary Russian workers' group as well as to learn the language.

I spent a day at this camp talking with the Chinese. They seemed extremely well satisfied. By no means were all communists, probably less than half belong to the Chinese party. Yet it was certainly true that the experience was revolutionizing their thinking and outlook.

There are other universities in Moscow where Chinese are being trained as, for instance, "The Communistic University of the Laboring Masses of the East in the Name of Stalin." Here there are only thirty Chinese, all communists, out of a student body of one thousand. But no other institution can be compared to Sun Yat-sen university, from which 300 students have been leaving yearly to enter China. They are going into all sorts of work and assuming all kinds of responsibilities. The impress which this group will make on Chinese life and politics can hardly be estimated at present. Granted that the education which they are getting is permeated with a communistic slant, nevertheless it is likely to make them more valuable to China if only because they will know Russian and something real about what the communists are doing.

B O O K S

The Christian Mind Through the Ages

THE MAKING OF THE CHRISTIAN MIND, *a Contour History of Christianity. By Gaius Glenn Atkins. Doubleday, Doran,* $3.00.

SOME DAY someone is going to write in one substantial volume a "story of Christianity" which will weave together the internal and external aspects of the development of Christianity and tell the story of its relation to the total stream of civilization during the two thousand years in which it has been the most important factor in determining the current of the world's history. Dr. Atkins' "Making of the Christian Mind" is not quite that book. Its title is more accurate than its subtitle. But the writer of that book will probably keep this one at his elbow and will incur great obligations to it, for Dr. Atkins tells one side of the story with great skill and a scholarly acquaintance with what has already been written upon the subject.

The mind of Christ and the creative spiritual impulse which he contributed to the world's thought and life—how the church lost the mind of Christ—how the Christian message interacted with Graeco-Roman paganism—how the Christian mind became doctrinal, institutional, mystical, monastic, humanitarian—how the spirit of liberty arose and took issue with authoritarianism—these are the main topics which give direction to his exposition. Inadequate as this syllabus is, it suggests the sweep of the discussion and large lines upon which it is organized. With an ample acquaintance with the historical data and the relevant literature, the author produces a brilliant generalization upon the course of development which has produced the historic and the current Christian attitudes.

The discussion of the mind of Christ and his specific contribution to the making of Christianity is open to the criticism of disposing of some of the issues by a treatment that is rather rhetorical than critical. The problem is oversimplified. If it is true that "we know enough to be sure of what He himself contributed," it is not without the most rigorous historical research that we know it; and such treatments as those of Guignebert and Case cannot be swept away by a footnote declaring that they "leave us up in the air." Again, it is comforting but vague to say that the "Christian way of living . . . has proved to be the true way of life," when there is so much still to be learned as to what specifically is the Christian way of living. For Atkins, however, it is "a spirit, not a

program." The historical evidence for the familiar statement that the world was in a panic over the expected end of the world in the year 1000, is scarcely adequate. Perhaps that will have to be classed as a legend, or at least an exaggeration, rather than a fact.

The view presented of the relation of Christianity to the mystery religions is that they were, alike, reactions to fundamental human needs rather than that Christianity is indebted to the mystery cults for any important part of its content. Some ritual practices were, to be sure, adopted by Christianity from these sources, but "the deliverance Greece and Rome sought was in Christianity to begin with." Hebrew hope and Christian message were recast in moulds which bore the marks of pagan cults, but there was something substantial to be recast—the life, death and resurrection of Jesus—and the author does not feel that much, if any, alloy entered into the metal when the recasting was done. The exact degree of influence exercised by the mystery religions upon the church is left in some respects an open question, though the author inclines to the somewhat cautious conclusions of Angus. The fundamental contrast between paganism and Christianity was that between a "world-accepting religion" and a "world-denying religion." But this merit of Christianity involved a defect when carried to excess, as appears in the history of monasticism and in an exaggerated asceticism. On the other hand, Christianity itself became world-accepting by its alliance with the state, its acquisition of wealth, and its exercise of worldly power. The contrast appears to hold good, not with regard to Christianity as an actual movement in history but as a principle arrived at either by exegesis or by a process of abstraction.

With the rise of the great theological questions involved in agnosticism, arianism and Nicene orthodoxy, the Christian mind became prevailingly doctrinal and the test of loyalty was the acceptance of the authorized creed. This quality continued in Protestantism, which gave it augmented emphasis and created a theologically minded laity, which Catholicism had never had because of its greater attention to custom, ritual, and symbols.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that Christianity is what it has become. Its essence is in its development and its functioning. A cross-section at no given moment—not even the first—least of all, perhaps, the first—can give us "essential Christianity" objectively existing as a pattern to be reproduced. But throughout its developing forms and functions there is a vital and permanent "principle of spiritual life."

I have no hesitation in recommending this as a book well worth buying, reading and keeping for reference and study. Its nearest parallel is Guignebert, from which it differs chiefly in the larger place which it gives to the unique contribution of Jesus. It is also reminiscent of Allen's "Continuity of Christian Thought"—an old book but not yet antiquated—to which, strangely, I believe the author nowhere alludes. It will be most intelligible and most valuable to those who are already well acquainted with the external history of the church and with the details of the history of Christian thought. For all such it will afford an extraordinarily valuable organization and interpretation of the development of Christianity.

WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Unappreciated Publicity

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: It is true that belief in "hexerei" or witchcraft and "powwowing" exists in York county, "the rich farming region of Pennsylvania," as you wrote in a recent editorial in The Christian Century. But why confine it to the farming regions? You will find evidences of it in cities and towns. And not only in Pennsylvania, but in every state of the union, especially where Pennsylvania Germans or their descendants have gone to reside. Among peoples everywhere you will find beliefs in "charms" and superstition. So, why pick on York county?

One would gather from reading your editorial that York county wasn't any more advanced in civilization than "the African bush or the interior of Santo Domingo." In fairness to the culture, the education and the progressive spirit of the inhabitants which ranks with the best, the wonderful spirit of denominational cooperation of the members of the Protestant churches in all matters that touch the moral welfare of the people, a spirit which every section of the country could well copy particularly where they pride themselves on their "progressiveness," and to the fact that York county and York city in particular are up among the leaders in the use of modern methods in industry and business, does the writer register his protest against the stigma of medievalism which editors and reporters throughout the land have been giving York recently.

York, Pa. IRVIN A. RAUBENHOLD.

A Helpful Offer

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: I am writing to tell you that I have discovered a process of reasoning that will, if continued to its logical conclusion, kill off the false doctrine of evolution which has infiltrated all of the Christian churches in America and in the world. My ideas are brand new, original, and never been spoken before. My subject can be reduced to some ten pages of typewriting, size of this. Our theological schools are right now honeycombed with evolution and atheism. Would you be interested in helping to kill evolution?

I am a man, a graduate physician, and also an *ordained evangelist*. I am 72, and consider myself the best posted, all round Bible scholar in this country. I believe that I have discovered how to *kill evolution*, and if so, I stand alone, for no other men have ever did this thing.

If my paper is acceptable, I would like to know about what pay I would receive for its publication? This is big game.

Ardmore, Okla. ARTHUR C. BELL, M. D., B. S.

Still Getting the Oxen Attached

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: If you never drove oxen and therefore made a technical slip in allowing Ezra Meeker to go west *"harnessing* an ox team to a prairie schooner," how can Judson S. West justify or excuse his version of the affair? If he had ever driven oxen would Ezra Meeker have *"yoked* them up and *hitched* them to the *prairie* schooner"? I ask the question because a laugh exploded spontaneously when I read his attempt to correct your literary technic, for in my young day nobody ever did either. In the vernacular of the time they simply "yoked the oxen to the cart," or the "cart to the oxen," or more simply still, they "yoked up the cart"—or any other vehicle or working tool.

If you question my recollection please refer to Webster, to wit: "Yoke, v. t."

Bolton, Mass. J. N. PARDEE.

The Debate on the Peace Pact

Including the Speeches by Senator William E. Borah and Senator Thomas J. Walsh as Delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 3, 4 and 15, 1929

JANUARY 3, 1929.

Speech of Senator William E. Borah.

MR. PRESIDENT, I think it will be helpful to the Senate and most agreeable to myself if prior to submitting to interrogatories or questions, I be permitted to make a connected statement as to the treaty, including a recital in the nature of a brief history of its negotiation, and as to the meaning of the treaty. I shall be very glad later to the best of my ability to answer any questions which may be propounded. I should like in the first instance to proceed, for a short time at least, uninterrupted.

Mr. President, the treaty which is before the Senate contains two articles, and only two, and I shall read those articles in order that we may have them in mind as we proceed with the discussion. Article I provides that—

> The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

Article II provides:

> The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

I think it is worth while to call particular attention to Article II. The general discussion in the popular consideration of the treaty has ranged almost entirely around Article I. To my mind the active virtue of the treaty lies in Article II. That article is in the nature of a pledge by the signatories to the treaty that they will in all controversies, of whatever nature or whatever origin, seek an adjustment through pacific means. That is the treaty. That expresses the real object and scope of the treaty.

Article I has significance in throwing light upon the meaning of Article II, but the practical provision of the treaty is contained in Article II.

Fifteen leading nations of the world upon August 27, 1928, signed this treaty at Paris. Since that time some 43 or 45 other nations have adhered to the treaty. The treaty itself provides the manner in which adherence shall be had. I think practically all nations now have adhered; only three or four have not, and the indications are that they will later adhere.

A brief history of the treaty may properly begin, I presume, with the statement of M. Briand made upon the 6th of April, 1927, on the tenth anniversary of the entrance of the United States into the World War. At that time in a public statement M. Briand said:

> France would be willing to subscribe publicly with the United States to any mutual agreement tending to outlaw war—to use an American expression—as between these two countries. The renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy is a conception already familiar to the signatories of the covenant of the League of Nations and of the treaty of Locarno.

This statement was made in the course of an address or interview; it was not communicated to this Government; but the statement of itself led to much discussion throughout the world and was given great consideration in the press of the United States.

Later, upon the 20th of June, 1927, the French Government proposed a treaty between the United States and France which I shall read. It will be observed when we read this proposed treaty that it is in the same language as the treaty which was ultimately signed, the only difference in the two being such differences as were necessary to transform a bilateral into a multilateral treaty. I shall read the proposal, notwithstanding it is a repetition, in order that we may have it before us and in the Record.

> Article I. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the name of the French people and the people of the United States of America that they condemn recourse to war and renounce it, respectively, as an instrument of their national policy toward each other.
>
> Art. II. The settlement, or solution, of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature, or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise between France and the United States of America shall never be sought by either side except by pacific means.

After the proposal was transmitted to the Government of the United States the Secretary of State met with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and discussed it. I shall not go into a discussion of what transpired in the committee, but, after meeting with the committee, the Secretary made answer to the French Government, and the change the Secretary of State proposed consisted of nothing more than the change from a bilateral to a multilateral treaty. It was thought by our Government that, if the principle announced upon the part of the French Government was a sound one, it ought to be applied to all governments which were willing to become signatory to such a treaty.

It was thought, furthermore, that a treaty of the nature proposed by the French Government confined to the French Government and to the Government of the United States would be something in the nature of an alliance, and that it would place our Government in an attitude which it did not desire to occupy, apparently being willing to enter into a peace treaty with one government which it was not willing to enter into with another. Thus the multilateral treaty was proposed by the Government of the United States. We took the proposal of France literally and declared it to be our desire to extend it to all other nations. I think all will agree that this was the wise thing to do.

A vast amount of correspondence followed. Much of that correspondence has, to my mind, now become immaterial. Some of the suggestions proposed were abandoned; others were met by interpretation. I do not think it necessary to go into detail as to that portion of the correspondence which seems to me at this time to be irrelevant and which throws no light upon the treaty as it was ultimately signed. That correspondence gave rise to two important questions, and outside of the correspondence in general and public discussion a third question has been raised. To those questions it seems to me proper to refer in the opening discussion of the treaty.

The question which may be considered first not only in point of time, but in some respects in importance is that of the right of self-defense under the treaty. It is conceded upon the part of all now that the right of self-defense is in no wise curtailed or embarrassed by the treaty, the Secretary of State taking the position, and the other governments promptly acceding to it, that the right of self-defense is an inherent right, implicit in every treaty; that it is a right which can not be bartered away, abrogated, or surrendered; and that each nation may under the treaty determine for itself when the right of self-defense arises and the extent to which it may go in defending its rights.

The criticism is at once made that this practically destroys the value of the treaty; that it is a weakness the measure of which can hardly be estimated, it is contended. If, say the critics, a nation may determine for itself what constitutes an attack and what constitutes the right of self-defense, it leaves the entire treaty and its effect within the judgment of any particular nation which may feel disposed to answer to an attack or threatened attack. I frankly concede, Mr. President, there is in that respect a weakness, but it is a weakness which is inherent in human nature and inherent in the conditions which obtain. I presume until we are willing to have a super-government, a government of sufficient sovereign power as a supergovernment to execute its decrees, that no nation will ever surrender or undertake to surrender—in my judgment it could not do so—the right of self-defense, and no nation will surrender the right to determine for itself what constitutes an attack or what is justification for defense. This is a right which must be conceded as a part of every treaty.

If the treaty undertook to provide such a surrender, I take it that it would not receive the support of anyone. It never would have been proposed by the President to the Senate, and would not meet with the approval of any Member of the Senate.

In discussing this question of self-defense, the Secretary of State had this to say:

The Government of the United States believes that the right of self-defense is inherent in every sovereign state, and implicit in every treaty. No specific reference to that inalienable attribute of sovereignty is, therefore, necessary or desirable.

Later, in a speech made upon the 11th of November, 1928, a further statement was made by the Secretary in regard to this matter:

The question was raised as to whether this treaty prevented a country from defending itself in the event of attack. It seemed to me incomprehensible that any nation should believe that a country should be deprived of its legitimate right of self-defense. No nation would sign a treaty expressly or clearly implying an obligation denying it the right to defend itself if attacked by any other country. I stated that this was a right inherent in every sovereign state and that it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require resort to war in self-defense. If it has a good case, the world will applaud it and not condemn it; but a nation must answer to the tribunal of public opinion as to whether its claim of the right of self-defense is an adequate justification for it to go to war.

The only censor—and these things we may understand and frankly admit—the only censor or criticizing power of a nation exercising the right of self-defense, if it does not exercise it upon true principle, is the power of public opinion. There being no supergovernment, no tribunal to which to appeal, and no one willing to create a supergovernment, and no authority otherwise to pass upon the matter, that is the only judge that we can rely upon to censor this part of the treaty. I know of no other tribunal to which we can appeal for the rectitude of nations in the exercise of this right of self-defense.

On page 28 of the pamphlet which contains the correspondence the British Government, in speaking of this matter, uses the following language:

The language of Article I, as to the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, renders it desirable that I should remind your excellency that there are certain regions of the world the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety. His Majesty's Government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions cannot be suffered. Their protection against attack is to the British Empire a measure of self-defense. It must be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty upon the distinct understanding that it does not prejudice their freedom of action in this respect. The Government of the United States have comparable interests, any disregard of which by a foreign power they have declared that they would regard as an unfriendly act. His Majesty's Government believe, therefore, that in defining their position they are expressing the intention and meaning of the United States Government.

We shall have occasion, no doubt, to recur to this paragraph often in this debate; and I propose at this time to treat it only as it relates to the particular matter which I am now discussing.

The British Government in this note undertakes to define what it conceives to be the principle or right of self-defense as applied to the British Government. It contends that there are certain regions, which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs afterwards more accurately defines, interference with which, or attack upon which, would be regarded as an attack upon the British Empire; and would call for the exercise of the right of self-defense under the treaty. It is an expression of view as to the application of this principle. But the note neither adds to nor detracts from the treaty, for this right of self-defense is complete under the treaty itself.

It may be said, and undoubtedly will be said, that this gives the British Empire a wide region of the world over which to exercise the right of self-defense; and it does. That is by reason of the fact that the British Empire's possessions cover all quarters of the globe. But I know of no way and I know of no desire to deny the British Empire or any other government the right of construing the treaty in accordance with what it conceives to be necessary for the defense of its country. That at least is what the British Government in this instance undertakes to do, and indicates what its policy will be in the application of this principle. We may differ from the application of the principle, but, under the treaty, she is answerable alone to her own sense of honor and to public opinion.

Later, in discussing this particular matter in the House of Commons, when the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was interrogated with reference to this note, Mr. Chamberlain used the following language:

I venture to think that it does no good to put about those exaggerated suspicions, and that it will be much more helpful to say, what is the fact, that our doctrine is exactly comparable to that of the American Government; that it is not a doctrine of aggression, that it is not a desire for territorial expansion, but a pure measure in self-defense necessitated by the geographical position of the Empire.

A fair construction, therefore, of the language used both in the note and in the debate is that the British Government is attempting to confine itself, and thinks it is confining itself, to a principle contained in the treaty, and a principle which no one disputes—that is, the right of self-defense.

The honorable gentleman found fault with the wording of my note with respect to the passage dealing with self-defense. He appeared to think that that was something which I had added, and that it had no parallel in the American note.

Then, in the language which I have just quoted, he undertakes to show that it is purely a matter of self-defense, and not in excess of the claim or different from the claim made in the American note.

I ought to say here that this question of self-defense had been discussed by the Secretary of State in a public speech prior to the time of this note, and that that public speech had been transmitted with the note.

France, in discussing this question, on page 44 of the pamphlet, says:

Nothing in the new treaty restrains or compromises in any manner whatsoever the right of self-defense. Each nation in this respect will always remain free to defend its territory against attack or invasion; it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defense.

The German Government, on page 24 of the pamphlet, says:

As the need of the nations for the assurance of peace since the World War has already led to other international agreements, the necessity arises for the states concerned to make a decision as to the relationship in which the pact now being planned would stand to these international agreements which are already in effect. You have already, Mr. Ambassador, referred in your note to the considerations which were put forward in this connection by the French Government in its exchange of views with the Government of the United States. So far as Germany is concerned, the covenant of the League of Nations and the Rhine pact of Locarno come into consideration as international agreements which might affect the substance of the new pact; other international obligations of this kind have not been entered into by Germany. Respect for the obligations arising from the covenant of the League of Nations and the Rhine pact must in the opinion of the German Government remain inviolable. The German Government is, however, convinced that these obligations contain nothing which could in any way conflict with the obligations provided for in the draft treaty of the United States. On the contrary, it believes that the binding obligation not to use war as an instrument of national policy could only serve to strengthen the fundamental idea of the covenant of the League of Nations and of the Rhine pact.

The German Government proceeds on the belief that a pact after the pattern submitted by the Government of the United States would not put in question the sovereign right of any state to defend itself. It is self-evident that if one state violates the pact the other contracting parties regain their freedom of action with reference to that state.

Without taking time to read the different notes of the other governments, all governments take the position that the right of self-defense is not impaired under the treaty. Whatever may be the value of the treaty, it must be measured in its value by the full conceded right of self-defense by all signatories to the treaty. In this connection I desire to call attention to Article II in connection with the principle of self-defense.

It must be borne in mind that Article II provides that—

The settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them (the High Contracting Parties), shall never be sought except by pacific means.

If we assume, for illustration, that a controversy is on between two powers, that a dispute has arisen, and the controversy has proceeded to the point where both governments are engaged in considering it, the government which desires to live up to the treaty would, in my judgment, under Article II, have a right to say and would be in duty bound to say, "We desire peaceful settlement of this controversy under Article II. You have pledged that you will settle all controversies with us, of whatever nature or of whatever origin, by peaceful methods. We are prepared to carry out our part of the engagement and ask for a peaceful solution of the controversy."

No government refusing to come into conference, or refusing to make an effort for peaceful settlement, could, in my judgment, ever afterwards successfully claim that it was in good faith acting in self-defense. It would have great difficulty in satisfying the public opinion of the world that it was acting in good faith. It would indeed be violating the treaty. Here is a method and a means by which to test any government which might be acting not in good faith under the treaty, and to place it in a position before the world where it would be practically impossible to defend its course or conduct.

Another principle with reference to the right of self-defense is that it consists of defense only. When the attack has been resisted and the danger has disappeared, the right of self-defense no longer exists, under any rule with which I am familiar.

Let me say here that I have made the statement publicly, with which some have found fault, that these letters in no wise change the treaty. I wish to reiterate that. I have no doubt as to the correctness of that position. I do not mean to say that notes might not deal with the subject and in a way which would, as notes, constitute a change in the treaty, which would put a construction upon the treaty at variance with the terms of the treaty. What I do mean to say is that these notes do not assume to make any change in the treaty, since they contend for nothing more than that which is conceded to be within the terms of the treaty. The notes state no principle in this matter not already found in the treaty.

When the writers discuss the right of self-defense, and state what they understand to be the right of self-defense, they are doing nothing more than they would have a right to do had no note ever been written. When they say that "under the treaty we reserve the right of self-defense," they are undertaking, if they should use that language, to reserve that which is already provided for and reserved in the treaty.

It is in this sense that it is my contention that none of this correspondence results in any modification of the terms of the treaty itself, and that the treaty as signed is that which is to guide. These terms have not been changed.

The second proposition of importance is the question of sanctions. What agreement, express or implied, do the signatories to the treaty make with reference to enforcing the treaty? Is force or punitive measures, express or implied, anywhere provided for in the treaty? If a nation violates the treaty are we under any obligation, express or implied, to apply coercive or punitive measures? I answer emphatically, no!

It will certainly not be contended that the language of the treaty itself makes any such provision. The language of the treaty refutes the proposition. The philosophy of the treaty is not that of preventing war, but that of organizing peace, which is a wholly different thing. The treaty is not founded upon the theory of force or punitive measures at any place or at any time. It does not rest upon the principles upon which alliances and balance of power ordinarily rest, that of force behind the treaty to be applied in case anyone transgresses the treaty. That is not, in my opinion, within the terms of the treaty. I know it is not within the express terms, and I am equally certain that it is not within the implied terms.

There certainly can not be any implication for the use of force under a treaty which rejects the use of power or force or under a treaty which pledges pacific settlement of all controversies of whatever nature or kind. From language which rejects war and pledges the nations to the settlement of their controversies through peace how can we imply the implication at any time or under any circumstances to use force or to administer coercive or punitive discipline?

Let us read this treaty again in connection with that argument. It is very brief, fortunately:

> They condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies.

The treaty condemns war; not aggressive war, which was rejected, not this or that kind of war, but war as an institution. It rejects war as a method for settling international disputes. War is not condemned under certain circumstances but all circumstances.

That being true and that being the language, how may we imply that outside of the language is an inference that we will do that which the language positively prohibits?

> And renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

Again, referring to article 2:

> The settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means.

So the language, plain, simple, and direct, that under no circumstances or conditions do we recognize coercive measures as a method of enforcing the treaty seems to be clear.

Not only is the language of the treaty, as I have indicated, clear and unmistakable, but at no time in this voluminous correspondence, coming up between 15 nations originally, and the correspondence laying the basis for adherence, has there been an indication or an implication that any nation conceived that there was any implied obligation upon the part of the nations to enforce the treaty or to punish an aggressor. At no time has that ever been suggested. They have swept the entire field of controversy and explanation with reference to possible exceptions or objections, but at no time and in no instance has any nation suggested that that implication might rest upon a government signing the treaty. The shrewd and discerning statesmen of 60 nations have failed to discover any such implications. And these same statesmen are as familiar with punitive measures and sanctions as any men anywhere on earth, for this is the first principle of European treaties.

I take it, Mr. President, that if such an implication should have been thought of, or had occurred to the mind of France or Great Britain, it would have been the first matter for consideration.

But I find nowhere in the language of the treaty or in the correspondence any reference to this matter, or any language which would indicate that it occurred to any of the Governments that such implication might arise.

It has been stated in the public press, by some critics of the treaty, that, while the language does not provide for force in the punishment of a violator of the treaty, such an implication is there; statements have been made, it is claimed, which indicate that Europe expects the United States will become responsible for the maintenance of the treaty even if force is necessary in order to maintain it.

Mr. President, I have been fairly familiar with the history of this treaty from its beginning, and before it began, and I have undertaken to follow as closely as I could the discussion of it, not only in this country but in foreign countries, both among public officials and the press, and I have been unable to find any discussion indicating any such opinion upon the part of the people of foreign countries. I know that that is not the construction which has been placed upon it very generally, not only by the press but by officials. The very opposite construction has been placed upon it over and over again by leading statesmen and publicists throughout Europe. I venture the opinion that no support for such a contention can be found in European thought.

At the time this treaty was signed, Lord Cushendun represented the British Government, owing to the fact that Sir Austen Chamberlain was ill. I do not think anyone familiar with the political philosophy of Lord Cushendun with reference to these matters and with his acute mind would suspect him of overlooking anything which might be appealed to in the way of force in connection with the enforcement of treaties. So startling a proposition as that of an implied obligation to use coercive measures against any nation which might break the treaty would scarcely escape his inspection of the document.

At the time the treaty was signed, Lord Cushendun said, in a public statement:

> In so far as America is concerned, I do not think the great part Mr. Kellogg has played should be interpreted to mean that we can expect any modification of the traditional American policy of aloofness. So far as the pact is concerned, it does not carry with it any implication on the part of America that she intends to enlarge her interest in European affairs.

This amounts practically to an official interpretation of the treaty by the British Government. At any rate, it strongly refutes the idea that the opinion is entertained in foreign countries that there is an implied obligation upon the part of the United States to use sanctions or to join in punishing European countries which would violate the treaty.

Later, and upon another occasion, Lord Cushendun said:

> There is an element in the British character which makes us shrink from expressing in exuberant language the ideals which nevertheless supply the motive power of our action, either as individuals or as a nation. And I do not hesitate to say that I look upon the Paris pact as an instrument that proclaims a new era and creates a new outlook. That may not be immediately observable.
>
> Human beings have to adjust themselves to a new environment. But the

up-growing generation, assimilating the new Zeitgeist will be nurtured in the idea that war, except in bona fide self-defense, is not a gallant adventure but a national dishonor.

* * * If this hope should be even partially realized, then assuredly this year, 1928, in which we live, will be remembered as a notable landmark in human history, for it will be the fulfillment of the dream of the most ancient visionaries of our race.

It is well, too, to mention the fact that Lord Cushendun here states that no war under the treaty is admissible except a war in bone fide self defense. That should be considered in connection with the British note.

Lord Grey, in discussing the treaty, used this language:

It is true there will be no sanctions under the American peace pact. Nations which sign it would not be under any obligations to take action against any nation which breaks it.

This is a statement by Lord Grey who has been an advocate and a strong advocate of the league and of the Locarno pact, and has been identified with all the peace movements since the great World War. It is his clear judgment, expressed by his emphatic and unmistakable language, that there are no implied sanctions, no promise express or implied upon the part of any nation to join in punishing one which shall break the treaty.

The London Daily News in discussing it said:

America herself is under no obligation to punish or share in the punishment of the nation which may break its pledge.

The Saturday Review discussed the matter a little more fully and referred to the difference which we ought to keep in mind as to this treaty and ordinary treaties with reference to peace. It said:

The essence of all European plans for preserving the peace has been the creation of sanctions against its violation. The essence of the American plan is that there shall be none but the moral sanction. The European school of thought seeks to preserve the peace by forming holy alliances to punish the aggressor; the American school rejects the idea of warlike sanctions and relies purely on the moral sanction. The one school seeks to create in a new form the old system of alliances to restrain an international criminal; the other is content to pronounce the sentence of outlawry against war and to trust to the conscience of nations to make it operative.

There, it seems to me, is an exact definition, an accurate distinction, between the ordinary peace treaties or alliances or balance of power and the present treaty. We ought to consider the treaty for what it is. It may in the minds of some impair its value when we take away the idea of force being behind the treaty or sanctions existing, express or implied, but nevertheless that is the treaty. There are no sanctions; the treaty rests in a wholly different philosophy.

I read a paragraph now from an address by Dr. David Jayne Hill, one of our own great students of peace questions and of treaties, as applied to the question of sanction:

From the draft of a bilateral treaty of perpetual friendship between France and the United States presented by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France under date of June 20, 1907, has been developed a multilateral treaty, signed at Paris on August 27 by 15 Governments, including 5 great military powers, to which a great number of others have since expressed their intention to adhere. * * * What, it is asked, is to happen to a contracting party if it violates the compact? Is the United States under obligation to bring it to task and punish it for its defection? Not at all. Such a delinquent will have proved its disloyalty to its pledged word, but the United States makes no pledge to improve its morals or to inflict upon it a penalty by making war upon it. The United States does not guarantee these signatures. It proposes a policy of voluntary peace. This policy is not identical with that of several European political and military combinations. Those compacts require the contracting parties to punish war with war. What then will be the probable action of the United States under this compact toward a military situation in another part of the world? It will first of all no doubt remind the delinquent signatories of their solemn agreement. It may properly call attention to the existence of Article II of the multilateral treaty and the obligations under it. But there is no enforcement clause in this compact.

There is no obligation to go further than the treaty provides, and that is to settle the controversy through peaceful means, and in so far as the United States should take an interest in a particular situation which may arise under the treaty it would be guided and be compelled to be guided in accordance with the principles of the treaty, and that is to bring about peaceful and pacific settlement of the controversy.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is it the Senator's view that there is any obligation upon the United States in the case just stated to make any representations at all?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think there is any obligation in the treaty, but I say that if the United States should act it could be presumed to act only in accordance with the principles of the treaty and not in conflict with them.

Mr. REED. But there is no obligation?

Mr. BORAH. There is no obligation whatever. This is a voluntary matter, as we might say, and as Doctor Hill said, in which they agree and pledge themselves respectively, to one another and to all, to settle their controversies through peaceful means; and if they violate that and disregard it, the treaty is at an end.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator, and apologize for interrupting.

Mr. BORAH. That is all right. I am always glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. In other words, the one nation would simply say to the other, "You are not the nation that I took you for," and that would end the episode?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think, if a nation should simply say, "You are not the nation I took you for" and say nothing more, that it would be a violation of the treaty, and it is not probable a nation would do anything of that kind.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I put it a different way, if it be accurate, and I ask whether or not the statement be accurate. Under the covenant of the League of Nations there was a moral obligation that existed, as the Senator believes?

Mr. BORAH. There was an express obligation.

Mr. JOHNSON. There was an express obligation, and it was an express obligation to enforce a breach of the peace or a violation of the provisions of the league?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no such obligation, express or implied, under the present treaty?

Mr. BORAH. No; there is no such obligation.

Mr. JOHNSON. Suppose, however, that all of the nations that are parties to the multilateral treaty are parties to the League of Nations covenant save the United States, and assume that the breach shall be a breach of the peace under both treaties. We would then be one nation that was not a member of the league where there was a breach of the obligation both of the league and of this treaty in relation to the peace. Would there then be any obligation, express or implied, on the part of the United States to act?

Mr. BORAH. Not at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in just a moment. In other words, the covenant of the League of Nations had certain express provisions with reference to maintaining peace. The United States not having joined the league could not be bound by any of the obligations, express or implied, of the league, and, although all members of the league might be bound by reason of certain conditions which should arise, the United States would not be bound.

Mr. JOHNSON. What I am endeavoring to make plain, if the Senator will permit me, is that the breach was, alike under the covenant of the league and under this treaty, a breach of the peace. All the nations except the United States under the covenant of the league would endeavor to enforce the obligation that rests upon them and against the party that was guilty of the breach. The United States then would stand aloof, the only nation on the face of the earth that was a party to the same breach in a different treaty, doing nothing at all, with no obligation either express or implied.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. In other words, when the treaty is broken the United States is absolutely free. It is just as free to choose its course as if the treaty had never been written.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I agree with the Senator that Article II is, of course, the most important part of the treaty. I assume the Senator believes with me that if the United States enters upon the treaty and becomes a signatory thereto, and if it is ratified by the Senate, the United States will be bound by the treaty and by Article II at all times.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is, bound so long as the treaty is not broken.

Mr. ROBINSON. To get at the question in just a little

different way from that which was suggested a moment ago, assume that France, for instance, and Colombia should get into a controversy of some sort and not observe the treaty. Assume that it led to warfare. What, then, should be the proper attitude of the United States under the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. The United States would be in just the attitude toward those nations that had broken the treaty and gone to war without regard to the treaty as if no treaty had been made. In other words, the moment a signatory to the treaty violates the treaty it releases all other nations as to that government violating the treaty.

Mr. ROBINSON. But assume that both of them insist they were acting in self-defense, then who is going to decide that question and, if it is decided, no matter how, what is to be the attitude then of the United States? Could the Senator tell me?

Mr. BORAH. The United States would have nothing to do with deciding the question of self-defense with reference to the action of any other nation unless the action of that nation were in the nature of an attack upon the United States itself. If that were true the United States would decide for itself what action it would take in that case.

Mr. ROBINSON. In that event would the Senator say that the United States under this treaty would be justified in going to war against France to protect her rights under the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. Absolutely. If the facts disclosed a disregard of the Monroe doctrine, that being a part of our self-defense, we would have the right to act in accordance with our free judgment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then the language does not mean what it says.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it does. It means exactly what it says.

Mr. ROBINSON. It says:

> The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Mr. BORAH. When France undertakes to settle it by other means than pacific means, by going to war, as the Senator said, France has violated the treaty and the United States is released. In addition to that, the Monroe doctrine raises the question of self-defense.

Mr. ROBINSON. But let us assume France insists that she is acting in self-defense.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose the Senator is getting at the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. ROBINSON. Precisely. If the Senator feels that this language does not mean what it says under certain conditions, then what would be the objection to a resolution setting forth exactly what we do mean by it, giving us the moral right ultimately to protect the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. In my opinion when we push the Monroe doctrine outside of the principle of self-defense we have no Monroe doctrine at all. There is only one principle upon which the Monroe doctrine has ever rested. We cannot maintain it upon any other principle. That principle is the right of self-defense. That was the principle which caused its enunciation. That is the principle upon which we have maintained it, and if we push it outside of that we have no right to interfere in South American affairs at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Precisely, but as the treaty now stands it is multilateral and we took the initiative to make it a multilateral treaty. To some degree, therefore, we are responsible for the treaty's being observed throughout the world because we took the initiative to make it multilateral.

Mr. BORAH. The fact that we took the initiative does not give rise to any implication or obligation other than that which is contained in the initiative which we finally consummated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Other signatories to the pact, however, found it necessary, or seemed to find it necessary, to write into their ratification in one manner or another the right of self-defense. Does not the Senator think that the United States, to be perfectly safe, ought to write the same kind of a provision into its ratification by the Senate?

Mr. BORAH. I take it that the Senator perhaps is not familiar with all the correspondence; but the first nation to write such a stipulation into this treaty—if that is what the Senator calls it; I do not call it that, because it was already in the treaty—was the United States. The United States said that under this treaty the United States ha. the absolute right of self-defense. Ours was the first Government so to state. My contention, however, is that the right of self-defense would have been just as plain and just as inalienable and just as perfect without any letter from anybody at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. But, Mr. President, if we should go to the defense of Colombia in a supposed case, such as I suggested a moment ago, and the other 50 or more signatories to the treaty—and none of them is any too friendly to us—should insist that we were not acting in self-defense in accordance with the treaty itself, I am asking the Senator then if we would not be proscribed by the remainder of the world? Then would we not possibly have to fight all the world to defend the Monroe doctrine? In other words, is it not about as well that we take care of our own business?

Mr. BORAH. Oh, it is exceedingly important that we take care of our own business, but it is also exceedingly important that we do it intelligently.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is just what I am suggesting.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Monroe doctrine, as I have said, in my judgment is just as much a principle of self-defense as is our right to resist if France should attack Norfolk, Va.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then, would there be any harm in saying so?

Mr. BORAH. We have said so.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can we not say so again in the ratification?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Indiana is saying so again, but it is in the treaty and saying so again adds nothing. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will please preserve order.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. This question came to my mind during the discussion. The League of Nations as a military alliance provides for sanctions in case of the violation of treaty obligations. If such a contingency should arise as that one of the signatories to the compact should violate the compact and the council of the league should invoke sanctions, should impose, for instance, an economic blockade upon the offending nation, and that blockade should interfere with the commerce of the United States, would the Senator believe that that was a violation of the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I had lost a paper, and while I was looking for it my attention was diverted from his question. Will he again state his question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If a condition should arise by which a member of the League of Nations should violate or in the opinion of the council should violate any of its obligations under the compact of the League of Nations, and the council, feeling competent to apply sanctions, as the pact provides, in order to discipline such nation, should do so, for instance, by the application of an economic blockade, and that blockade should interfere with the commerce of the United States, should interfere with our right to trade, would the Senator believe, if such a condition should arise, that it would be a violation of the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. No; I should not. In other words, as I understand the Senator's question, it is this: If under Article XVI of the League of Nations conditions should arise which would justify, in the opinion of the league, the application of a blockade, and the League of Nations should put into execution a blockade, the question which the Senator is interested in, I take it, is whether or not we would be bound to recognize that blockade in carrying on our commerce? In my opinion, this treaty does not affect such a situation at all and has nothing whatever to do with it. Our right to trade and our commercial rights would in nowise be affected.

We would as a neutral, and not being a member of the league, have the right to carry on our trade under the rules of the sea, and this treaty would not curtail or embarrass that right. If a controversy should arise we would then be bound to settle the controversy through peaceful methods.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I should like to inquire about how long he thinks the war would have to last before we could settle such a controversy by peaceful means?

Mr. BORAH. Perhaps I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. REED. About how long does the Senator think the war, of which we have been speaking, would have to last in order for us to settle our right to violate the blockade and settle it by peaceful means?

Mr. BORAH. We would not have anything at all to do with the time the war lasted.

Mr. REED. The Senator does not understand me.

Mr. BORAH. No; seemingly I do not.

Mr. REED. Perhaps I asked the question stupidly.

Mr. BORAH. I think not, but probably we are thinking about two different things.

Mr. REED. The question is in connection with the colloquy which has preceded. I understood the Senator from Idaho to say in answer to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] that if the League of Nations were to declare a blockade and we were to disregard the blockade and a controversy should arise, it would then be our duty under the so-called Kellogg treaty to settle that controversy by peaceful means. I asked the Senator how long he thought the war would have to last for us to get a decision by peaceful means in a controversy of that kind.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know, and neither would I care particularly, because we would conduct our commercial transactions upon the theory that we had a perfect right to do so, and the pending treaty would have no application to such a situation at all.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. Only in such an instance where an actual controversy arises which we would recognize would we be under any obligation to negotiate with any nation which was interested in the blockade.

Mr. REED. I do not desire to prolong the discussion, and I apologize to the Senator for having asked the first question which started all of these questions after he asked not to be interrupted; but, since he has been interrupted, let me follow the illustration, merely to get the Senator's opinion. I do not, as I have said, care to debate it at this time, but I should like to get the judgment of the Senator from Idaho.

Assume that a war is threatened and that the League of Nations, under Article II, proceeds to declare that there is a threat of war between two nations, either members or non-members, and thereupon the league applies sanctions, or declares a blockade or goes to war and resorts to force, all of which, of course, is reserved in Article II. Among other things, the league undertakes to blockade the ports and destroy the commerce of the offending nation, and seizes our ships passing over the high seas to the ports of the nation declared to be the offending nation. Of course, we can protest by peaceful means, but I reaffirm practically what I intimated in my question, that I think it would be a very long war and would not be terminated before we would get through with peaceful negotiations.

If, instead of doing that, we were to do what we would do if we had not signed this treaty, if the case became aggravated we would convoy our merchant ships by our men-of-war.

Mr. BORAH. Which we would have a perfect right to do under this treaty.

Mr. REED. But suppose some ship of the league or some nation controlled by the league should attempt to take a merchant vessel from under the guns of our man-of-war, what would we do—negotiate or defend? And does not this treaty absolutely bind us not to fire a shot in defense of that vessel?

Mr. BORAH. Not at all; not at all.

Mr. REED. Then we are at perfect liberty to go anywhere we want to in the world on all the waters of the seven seas, without waiting for negotiation to defend the rights of American citizens and American property by our cannon and our men just as we are now if we do not sign this treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if such an incident should occur as that which the Senator relates, it would be an act of war upon the part of the nation attacking us. If it undertook to take our property or take our citizens from under our protection, in my opinion that would constitute an act of war. The nation guilty of such act would have violated the treaty and we would be released.

Mr. REED. We might so treat it, but the other nation, on the other hand, could claim that it was merely exercising a proper right of search and seizure under the law of nations.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is now stating an entirely different proposition.

Mr. REED. That would be the claim at the time; and the question is, under the terms of this treaty should we surrender that vessel and go to some tribunal somewhere to settle the controversy, or are we by this treaty left at liberty to act just the same as though we had not signed the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. In my opinion, if the acts of the government to which the Senator refers, whatever government it might be, were such as to constitute war we would be relieved, of course, from the obligations of this treaty. If they were not such as to constitute war, of course we would be bound by the terms of the treaty.

Mr. REED. The mere taking of a merchant vessel under a claim of right is not an act of war in itself. I do not want to debate the question; I merely wish to get the Senator's view of it.

Mr. BORAH. Let me state it a little more fully then. If the act of the nation in challenging our right upon the sea should be such as to constitute an attack by force to take possession of our citizens or our property it would undoubtedly constitute an act of war. If, on the other hand, the action of the Government should be nothing more than the exercise of a right under maritime law to search for contraband and seize it, it would not be an act of war, and we would not be justified in using force. That is precisely the principle which we followed during the World War.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will pardon me for asking a further question, has it not been the claim at all times of all of the nations which have seized the commerce of other nations upon the high seas that they were acting in accordance with the laws of war and merely searching or seizing because contraband or alleged contraband was being carried?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, a nation might make a claim that it was acting in self-defense when it was not; it might make a claim that it was complying with maritime law when it was not; that is a situation that cannot be obviated, of course; but I am assuming now in discussing this treaty that there is an honest effort to live up to the terms of the treaty and that the nations are acting in good faith in regard to it. If that be true, the nations would have no right to use force while a government was pursuing the course mapped out by maritime law with reference to searching for contraband.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator feel that there is anything in this treaty which changes American practice and American policy for the past century in regard to sending our warships and marines into various parts of the world to defend the lives of American citizens or the property of American citizens which may be threatened?

Mr. BORAH. As I understand, it is a well-established rule and principle of international law that a nation—the United States, for illustration, here—would have a perfect right, without going to war or being under the principle of war, to protect the lives and property of its citizens from threatened attack in foreign countries. If it goes beyond the principle or the necessity of protecting the lives and property of its citizens and interferes with the political organization of the foreign government and attacks its sovereignty or its sovereign rights, of course that is war; but so long as its action consists of defending and protect-

ing the lives and property of the citizens it is not war, and never has been regarded as war. International law does not treat such action as war, and no nation has a right to call it war; so this treaty would not affect that situation at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator think, then, that under this treaty we would have the right to deal with foreign nations under all the various forms of nonamicable measures, short of war, which are recognized in international law?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I think so—short of war, if conditions justified.

Mr. BINGHAM. Including reprisals?

Mr. BORAH. We now settle those things by peaceful means if we can. We undertake to settle them in the same way in which this treaty provides for settling them. That is our policy. That has been our policy since the beginning. If a nation refuses settlement by peaceful means we may rest upon our rights under international law even to the extent of reprisals or other more amicable methods.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then the Senator does feel that the treaty represents no change in our policy?

Mr. BORAH. Not in regard to the matters of which the Senator has now spoken, always taking the acts of the other nation into consideration.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is, with regard to the defense of American lives and property abroad?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. I do not wish the Senator to understand from that, however, that in looking back over the past I regard all acts in defense of the lives and property of American citizens in foreign countries as coming under the rule which I have just stated. I think we have carried on war in certain instances. I do not care to go into that discussion now; but I should not want to be understood as asserting that in all the things we have done heretofore we have kept out of war. I state a principle and do not approve any particular instance.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator mentioned, in the second article of the treaty, particularly the last phrase, "except by pacific means." Before the Senator gets through will he explain to us, so that there may be no doubt about it, that a good deal of what has been published in the press as to what is meant by "pacific means" is incorrect, and that the phrase "pacific means" includes nonamicable measures short of war, which might also include such things as a display of, or restricted use of, force, embargo, nonintercourse, reprisals, retortion, and the breaking of diplomatic relations?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, to state in a single paragraph what I understand this treaty to mean in connection with that question, it is this:

We pledge ourselves by this treaty to adjust our controversies with other nations through peaceful means. That may consist of settling them through diplomatic channels; it may consist of settling them under the conciliation treaties, or the arbitration treaties, or The Hague tribunal, or any other method which at the time we may be able to devise to come to an understanding with that nation, this side of war.

Mr. BINGHAM. All the means which the Senator has just referred to are in international law usually considered to be "amicable" means of settling a question. The Senator has not yet referred to those five or six means generally referred to as "nonamicable means short of war," which are sometimes held to include also pacific blockades.

Mr. BORAH. We would undoubtedly have the right to employ all means coming within the pacific settlement or the peaceful settlement of disputes which are this side of war. For instance, if we wanted to break off diplomatic relations with a country, there would be nothing in this treaty to prevent that. It is not necessarily regarded as an act of war. But undoubtedly the treaty obliges us to employ peaceful methods and we depart from that only when such methods are rejected or disregarded by the other nation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Then there is nothing under the treaty which would prevent us from sending a cruiser into the heart of China, to the port of Hankow, as we had to do last year, if we believe that American lives and property are in danger there?

Mr. BORAH. I understand not; because that would not be an act of war. It never has been held to be an act of war. I assume that life and property are in actual danger.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, if under the treaty we are permitted to send our cruisers to all parts of the world where we think American lives are in danger, the ratification of the treaty would in no way diminish our necessity for cruisers?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know about that. I am not committed to that doctrine without explanation. That is to say, I do not think that it likely will result in diminishing our desire for cruisers at once. It is my hope that if this treaty obtains the confidence and fath of the nations and they live up to the treaty, in time disarmament will inevitably follow to a marked degree, just as in the relationship between this country and Canada through a hundred years we have lived on the most peaceful terms. We have destroyed our forts and all means of protecting one another by force along the border. That has ripened into a sentiment in both countries which gives us entire confidence in each other.

It is my hope that in time this treaty would have an effect of that kind. I am not, however, one of those who believe that we should tomorrow, by reason of signing this treaty, disband our Army or destroy our Navy, because we can reduce our Navy only in proportion to some degree, at least, as other nations do the same thing. We must get the confidence of those nations in peaceful methods and the settlement of disputes through peaceful methods before we can expect them to reduce their navies to any marked degree; and so long as they do not reduce theirs it is but wisdom that we keep a reasonable navy for the purpose of protecting ourselves.

Another proposition is that this treaty does not at all impair the right of self-defense. The Navy as a whole will not be destroyed in my time, or the Senator's, because that confidence will not arrive to that extent. Nevertheless, in my judgment that will not prevent a reasonable reduction of armament when the nations come to have more confidence in the settlement of their controversies through peaceful means, and it is my great hope that it will bring about a state of international confidence and good will which will reduce armaments. But the treaty must be given time to effectuate that confidence and in the meantime let us not destroy our navies, but keep them down to a reasonable protection of our rights at sea.

As a matter of fact, there is not a thing in this treaty that has not been a fundamental foreign principle of ours from the beginning of the Government until this hour. There is not a principle in it that we have not advocated over and over again since John Jay signed the first treaty for the settlement of all controversies through peaceful means.

Mr. JOHNSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question following what he has said, which I think is quite accurate, and with which I have full sympathy.

Could the United States, if this pact had been in full force and effect, have fought the Spanish-American War?

Mr. BORAH. In my judgment it could, upon the theory upon which we professed to fight it. Our ships had been attacked, our people had been murdered, and we had a perfect right to defend ourselves against these attacks.

Mr. JOHNSON. But does not the Senator think the cause of the Spanish-American War was far different from that?

Mr. BORAH. It might have been the cause. If so it would have been prohibited by this treaty.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did we not fight it upon an entirely different basis from that?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know what the Senator has in his mind.

Mr. JOHNSON. Nonamicable reasons have been given by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. Rather sentimental reasons dictated the Spanish-American War, did they not?

Mr. BORAH. Well, I suspect that those reasons entered into it. I should hope that if we ratify this treaty we would be more

vigilant in confining ourselves to actual attacks and not sentimental attacks. But our ship had been sunk, American lives lost, and we at least professed to be moved in the protection of life and property.

Mr. JOHNSON. But I understand that the Senator says that with this treaty in full force we could still have fought, without being guilty of a violation of it, the Spanish-American War.

Mr. BORAH. On the basis, as I say, of the blowing up of the *Maine*. I do not know who was responsible, but the disaster had occurred and it was for our Government to determine who was responsible.

Mr. JOHNSON. But upon the basis of the facts that are before us, and the reasons that were given, we could have fought that war?

Mr. BORAH. I think we could. But only upon the theory that we acted in good faith in defending against any further attacks.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does not the Senator recall that when the *Maine* was blown up the Spanish Government immediately disclaimed the act, and that the Spanish Government made almost every conceivable effort to avoid the war by peaceful means? If this treaty had been in effect, surely we would have been bound, under the representations of the Spanish Government, to have arbitrated that matter.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we would not be bound under this treaty, in my opinion, in any different way than that in which we were bound at that time, for this reason: We either acted in good faith or in bad faith with reference to the reason why we fought the Spanish-American War. We could doubtless assign a bad reason and a hypocritical reason under this treaty. We were under obligations to settle with Spain at that time through peaceful means, according to the principles which we had announced for a hundred years, if we believed that Spain was acting in good faith, and that we could protect our rights through peaceful means.

But after the incident as it occurred, after our property had been destroyed and American lives destroyed, it was for the Government of the United States to determine what constituted a real defense of our rights; and when this treaty is ratified it will be for the Government of the United States to determine, upon any particular state of facts or any set of conditions, as to what constitutes a defense of its rights. The principle of the treaty is that we can only go to war in self-defense; if we did not do that in the Spanish-American War, then it would have been barred by this treaty.

Mr. REED. That would be true of every other nation and every case.

Mr. BORAH. I said in the beginning that we must admit that the fact that every nation had a right to determine for itself what constitutes self-defense, and how it should apply, is a weakness upon the part of the treaty; but it is a weakness which is inherent in the condition of things which now confronts the world. There is no Senator in this Chamber who would more seriously and effectively attack a treaty which undertook to deny the right of the United States to self-defense than the able Senator from Missouri. There is no way to bridge that chasm.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was called out of the Chamber and did not hear all of the Senator's discussion as to just what this treaty includes. As I understand the Senator construes this treaty, or Article II of it at least, to mean that as to every controversy, of whatever nature or character, that might arise out of the application or interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, the treaty compels us to submit it to arbitration or to make every possible effort to arrive at a pacific settlement. What effect would that have upon a controversy similar to that which arose between Great Britain and Venezuela during the administration of President Cleveland?

Mr. BORAH. What we undertook to do at that time was to bring about exactly that situation, a peaceful settlement of the controversy; and that is what we did.

Mr. BARKLEY. But there was some strong language used in the message of the President on that subject, which indicated that if Venezuela and Great Britain were unable to settle their dispute amicably we would probably settle it in another way.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; and if this treaty were ratified and any nation refused to settle a controversy of that kind through peaceful means, disregarded our request in regard to it, and violated the Monroe doctrine, we would have a perfect right to defend the Monroe doctrine, just as we proposed to do at that time. We would be under obligation to do what we did do, to settle the controversy through peaceful means if possible; but the Monroe doctrine constituting an element of self-defense of the United States, we would have a perfect right to defend the Monroe doctrine, if it was attacked or defied through the acts of a European power.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event there might be a conceivable controversy between some European nation and some South American or Central American nation involving a question of territory, which, if settled amicably, might result in the cession of a certain portion of territory in this hemisphere to the European nation as a part of an amicable settlement, would our consent to such a settlement in any way involve the abrogation of the Monroe doctrine upon the part of the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes. The primary principle of the Monroe doctrine is that no foreign government shall acquire territory in South or Central America.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was not the original primary object. It was to prevent any European government taking any territory here if it was for the purpose of obtaining a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, but it did not cover a controversy over a boundary line. It was intended to keep European nations from an attitude of aggression in the Western Hemisphere, but not originally did it involve the question of disputes in good faith over boundary lines. I think our modern interpretation of the doctrine has been extended to the question of boundary lines. But would the Senator consider that we would in any way abrogate our right to assert the Monroe doctrine by the ratification of this treaty, under which we are obligated to resort to every possible means to settle disputes amicably, in the case of a dispute between a European nation and a South American nation over a question of that sort, which might result in a cession of territory to a nation which the Monroe doctrine involved?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think this treaty would in any way embarrass or impair our rights in asserting and maintaining the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the Senator thinks those rights are governed by our own interpretation of the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. The Monroe doctrine is our doctrine. We announced it ourselves. It is a principle of self-defense. We alone interpret it. As Mr. Wilson said, we interpret it, and we will never consent to anybody else joining us in interpreting it. Therefore, if a government of Europe should challenge whatever we deem to be the Monroe doctrine, refuse to settle a controversy between us with regard to it peacefully, we would undoubtedly be the sole judges, ourselves, of what constitutes the Monroe doctrine and how we should defend it.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if any European nation and any South American nation should settle a dispute amicably between themselves but in our judgment that settlement, amicably arrived at, involved the question of the interpretation and application of the Monroe doctrine, we would then have the right to step in and interfere with that settlement, if necessary, even to the extent of going to war?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. That is, in case the government refused to settle with us peacefully.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, if both governments refused to settle with us?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, earlier in the Senator's speech he said that if one nation should claim that it was acting upon the principle of self-defense, and another nation said, "I am willing to submit all these questions to arbitration," then that would determine the fact as to who was the aggressor. That is practically what the Senator said.

Mr. BORAH. What I undertook to say was this, that as a test of the good faith of a nation which was claiming to be acting in self-defense, if we should say to that nation, "Let us settle this matter peacefully, let us adjust our controversy, let us arbitrate," and that nation should refuse any overtures of that kind, it would be very difficult for that nation to claim that it was acting in self-defense.

Mr. CARAWAY. In other words, the other nations would be justified in regarding that nation as an aggressor which refused to enter the settlement?

Mr. BORAH. I think they would be.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am asking the question because the Senator said, in answer to a question of the Senator from California, that we could have fought the Spanish-American War, if this treaty had been in effect, without violating its provisions. As I now recall, Spain disclaimed any responsibility for the sinking of the *Maine*, and was willing to settle those questions peacefully. How could we justify ourselves, under this treaty, in refusing to do that?

Mr. BORAH. As I said a moment ago, when you take into consideration the fact that the *Maine* had been blown up, our property destroyed, our means of defense attacked, and our citizens killed, the mere fact that Spain or some other government might disclaim its acts would not of itself be conclusive. The crime having been committed, the deed having been accomplished, the lives of our citizens lost, it would be for us to determine whether the disclaimer was in good faith and whether their action necessitated our action in regard to it. I repeat I do not pretend to say who, in fact, was responsible.

Mr. CARAWAY. In other words, as I understand the Senator, we could look within the minds of people and say, "While you say you are our friends, you are in fact our enemies," and still keep the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly. We would judge from all the facts —acts as well as words.

Mr. CARAWAY. I asked the questions because I did not understand the logic of that position.

(At this point Mr. BORAH yielded the floor for the day.)

Friday, January 4, 1929

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when the discussion ended last evening at the close of the session we had under consideration the effect of the pending peace treaty upon the Monroe doctrine. I had not intended to discuss that feature of the subject in my opening remarks upon the treaty, but since questions relating to it have been submitted and it is now before the Senate I think I may conclude what I have to say in regard to that particular subject.

As I understand, the Monroe doctrine rests upon the principle of self-defense; that is the theory upon which it was promulgated and that is the theory upon which it has been maintained. As it is conceded under this treaty that each nation has the right of self-defense and to determine for itself what constitutes self-defense, it is my opinion that the Monroe doctrine is in no wise embarrassed or curtailed, and neither is the Government of the United States embarrassed in the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine.

A brief reference to the message itself originally announcing this doctrine is sufficient to sustain the theory upon which the Monroe doctrine rests. Mr. Monroe said:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. . . . We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. . . . It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness.

The circumstances under which the Monroe doctrine was announced will be recalled. Certain European powers, then operating largely under an organization known as the Holy Alliance, were engaged either in preventing the independence of South American countries or in destroying the independence of those which had been successful in achieving it. The very basic purpose of the Holy Alliance, notwithstanding it was originally announced as a peace organization, was to destroy all forms of free government. Its great object was to establish and maintain despotic forms of government. Not only, therefore, was the encroachment upon the western continent by the European powers deemed injurious to the United States or a menace to its peace and safety as a general proposition, but the particular philosophy or policy of those who at that time were carrying on this program was deemed especially dangerous to our peace and welfare.

The original purpose of the Monroe doctrine has since been maintained. I am one of those who believe that the Monroe doctrine has been wrenched from its original moorings in many respects, but, nevertheless, it has always been contended that whatever we have done under that doctrine we have done upon the theory of self-defense or for the security and safety of the Nation.

Mr. GLASS. With respect to an accurate definition of the Monroe doctrine and its scope, I should like to propound an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Recently there was friction between two South American countries, both of them members of the League of Nations. Suppose, under article 10 of the league covenant, there had been consideration of the question as to how the league would proceed with reference to that quarrel, and it had been determined by the league to interfere in a coercive way against, perhaps, we might say, the offending nation party to the quarrel. What would have been the attitude of the United States toward a decision of that sort, under the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I would hesitate to answer that question offhand; but, in my opinion, the Monroe doctrine would not be infringed or challenged by any effort upon the part of foreign governments amicably or peacefully to arrange the difficulties of two South American countries. If the foreign governments were solely interested in the question of establishing peace between two South American countries, and not in any sense interested in establishing themselves in South or Central America or destroying South or Central American governments, I do not see how the Monroe doctrine would be in any way challenged.

Mr. GLASS. I cannot either; but I wanted to be assured as to that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to vote for the ratification of the treaty, but I want to know just where we are going in view of the answer to the question just asked by the Senator from Virginia. Would it be possible for foreign nations to coerce one of the governments referred to and make it yield to the other under the claim of bringing about a peaceful settlement of their controversy?

Mr. BORAH. As I have said, I hesitate to answer that kind of a question. I do not understand that the Monroe doctrine would inhibit a foreign government from undertaking to arrange the difficulties of two South American countries. When it is undertaken to employ the doctrine of force, however, or to coerce one of such governments, there is a possibility involved of the violation of the Monroe doctrine which undoubtedly would interest the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. The reason I am asking the Senator the question is that one nation at least in its correspondence preceding the ratification of this treaty referred to its obligation under the treaty of Versailles. Under that treaty, of course, if the league should decide to act, force could be used, blockades could be maintained, and so on.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption there, as I understand, the Covenant of the League of Nations specifically excludes the Monroe doctrine from its operation. Is not that true?

Mr. BORAH. That was the intention; yes.

Mr. SWANSON. That is what we insisted upon as a condition of going into the league.

Mr. GLASS. But what I am trying to get at is, What is the application of the Monroe doctrine to the case that I stated?

I do not think it has a thing in the world to do with it; but I wanted to educe the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. The purpose of the Monroe doctrine, as I understand it, was to prevent European powers from taking possession of the territory of South America——

Mr. GLASS. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. Or demolishing or breaking down the governments of South America, and establishing on the South American continent their own government or their own control. So long as the purpose of European governments is free from those propositions, I do not know of anything in the Monroe doctrine that would inhibit them from taking part in a peaceful adjustment of South American affairs.

Mr. CARAWAY. Pardon me; I do not understand from the statement of the Senator from Virginia that the foreign governments would——

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, we are unable to hear what is being said. We should like to hear this colloquy.

Mr. CARAWAY. All I was trying to do was merely to clarify the answer of the Senator from Idaho. I did not quite follow him. If, under the treaty of Versailles, the league should use force—either commercially or the force of arms—to bring about a settlement between South American countries, of course to that extent it would infringe the liberty of those nations. Did I understand the Senator to say that that would not be a violation of the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. I said that the Monroe doctrine had for its purpose——

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand its purpose.

Mr. BORAH. I would not undertake to say that a particular situation did not challenge the Monroe doctrine until I knew what all the facts were; but if the nations were engaged in an effort to adjust amicably differences between them, and not in an effort to satisfy their own ambitions or to satisfy their own interests or to establish themselves on the South American continent, I do not see how the Monroe doctrine would interfere.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not, either, under that statement; but what I am coming to is this: If they may use force to compel a South American nation to accept an agreement, they do establish themselves to that extent upon the Continent of South America, do they not?

Mr. BORAH. No; not necessarily.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why, Mr. President, under the Monroe doctrine we even objected to their taking charge of the customs down in Venezuela to collect foreign debts.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; we objected. But we have not always objected to foreign governments collecting their debts.

Mr. CARAWAY. And we prevented its being done.

Mr. BORAH. We did in some instances. We have done many things under the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. CARAWAY. Even holding elections down there under the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. I presume it was claimed to be under the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, of course——

Mr. BORAH. Let me say this, and then I will yield to the Senator further: Without, of course, objecting to the question, I do not feel that this question has any relevancy to the treaty before us, for this reason: Whatever the Monroe doctrine is, and whatever we decide the Monroe doctrine to be from time to time, based upon the principle of self-defense, we are just as free to decide and just as free to execute under this treaty as if no treaty had been made, for the reason that the Monroe doctrine is simply an extension of our system of self-defense. Now, we may misconstrue the Monroe doctrine. We may have done so in the past. This treaty will not prevent the misconstruction, in all probability, if we base it upon the proposition that we are acting under it and acting in defense of our interests.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am inclined to agree with the Senator about that. The thing I wanted to be perfectly clear about was that it was not in the mind of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that we were conceding to other people a power to act in South America in connection with this treaty.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think this treaty gives them any more right to act than if the treaty did not exist.

Mr. CARAWAY. We are not, then, by our very discussion of it, making any concession that they have any power to coerce South American nations?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly not.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the resolution introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses]; and I take it, from the very able presentation of the Senator's views with regard to this treaty, that he thinks the Monroe doctrine will be just as safe without the first paragraph of this resolution as with it?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. McLEAN. Then what is the harm, in the mind of the Senator, in the Senate agreeing with him on this subject, and formally stating that the treaty does not impair or abridge the right of the United States to defend its territory or other vital interests?

Mr. BORAH. When I come to those resolutions, if they are ever presented, I will state why I think that they ought not to be adopted. That would lead me into a field which I have no intention of covering at this time, but I shall be very glad to cover it then.

Mr. McLEAN. I hope, when the Senator does that, he will bear in mind Mr. Kellogg's official communication to the powers delivered on June 23, 1928, in which he defines what he considers to be the right of self-defense—that is, in my opinion, he defines it—and uses the following language:

> Every nation is free at all times and regardless of treaty provisions to defend its territory from attack or invasion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while I do not desire to discuss that at this time, let me say this much: The Senator is now reading from a speech which the Secretary of State made, which speech was transmitted to the other powers; but the Senator omits to read the letter itself.

Mr. McLEAN. No; I am reading from the letter.

Mr. BORAH. Now, let me read from the letter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It ought to read alike, no matter who reads from it.

Mr. BORAH. This is in the letter. The part which the Senator from Connecticut read was in the speech which was incorporated in the letter.

Mr. McLEAN. I am reading from this printed document——

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I know the Senator is, but he is reading from page 37, and I am reading from page 38.

Mr. McLEAN. No; I am reading from page 36.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. We might have an arbitration to settle this dispute.

Mr. BORAH. In the letter, following the speech, the Secretary of State says:

> The right of self-defense is inherent in every sovereign State and implicit in every treaty.

That is the statement of the Secretary of State, without any limitation as to territory or anything else. The French Government used, by way of illustration, the same illustration that the Secretary of State used—that every government had a right to defend its territory. That was simply by way of illustration. But in this letter, and in another letter written by the Secretary of State, he makes no reference whatever to the question of territory, but puts it upon the broad grounds that every government has a right to defend itself, and to determine for itself what constitutes self-defense.

Mr. McLEAN. Precisely. The Monroe doctrine is not mentioned in any of the Secretary's communications; but on the 23d of June, 1928, in his official communication to the powers, I quoted his language at the bottom of the page under the heading of "Self-defense," and I have read to the Senate what he says:

Mr. WATSON. Read it again.

Mr. McLEAN (reading):

> Every nation is free at all times and regardless of treaty provisions to defend its territory.

I take it that the Monroe doctrine goes far beyond the defense of our territory; and I am informed that the South American countries object to the ratification of this treaty, or will object, if the Monroe doctrine is mentioned; and I suspect that the language used by Mr. Kellogg in his note to the powers was very significant when he said that it included the right to defend our territory from attack.

Mr. BORAH. Let me assure the Senator from Connecticut that the reference of territory was not significant in the sense that he was undertaking to limit it in deference to the views of South America.

Mr. McLEAN. Then may I propound another question?

Mr. BORAH. I will ask the Senator to wait until I get through with my reply to his first question. If the Senator would read the entire communication of the Secretary of State he could not reach any other conclusion than that the Secretary of State stated the principle of self-defense in the very broadest terms. The Senator picks a single sentence, but omits to read:

> There is nothing in the American draft of an antiwar treaty which restricts or impairs in any way the right of self-defense. That right is inherent in every sovereign State and is implicit in every treaty.

If you are indulging in strict technical interpretation, what are we defending when we are executing the Monroe doctrine? What are we defending?

Mr. McLEAN. That is the point.

Mr. BORAH. We are defending the territory of the United States, and, as Mr. Cleveland said, we are defending our institutions. We are defending our form of government. We are defending the Capitol here just as much as we are defending any portion of our rights.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not agree with that proposition; but the Secretary——

Mr. BORAH. What are we defending when we defend the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. McLEAN. It is very difficult to define the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BORAH. I am not asking the Senator to define the Monroe doctrine. When we maintain the Monroe doctrine, and seek to enforce it and defend ourselves against its being broken down, what are we defending?

Mr. McLEAN. We may be defending the lives of our citizens abroad. We may be defending their property.

Mr. BORAH. And we may be defending our territory.

Mr. McLEAN. We may be; but we may not be defending our territory when we are defending the lives of our citizens abroad.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. Kellogg does not say we are confined to that.

Mr. McLEAN. But, if the Senator will pardon me, Mr. Kellogg clearly states that the right of self-defense cannot be defined. He says it in all of his communications.

Mr. BORAH. And therefore he does not attempt to define it.

Mr. McLEAN. Then he does attempt to define it in the paragraph which I have read. That, I think, is the danger, and that is the reason why I think we should adopt the first section of the Moses resolution. I think the Senator will agree with me that if Mr. Kellogg had inserted, after the word "territory," the words "or other vital interests," it would have indicated a degree of wisdom on his part which I certainly should heartily approve.

Mr. BORAH. I am not clear as to how you would defend other vital interests, separated and divorced from our territory. If we defend our territory, that is one of the items in our self-defense.

Mr. McLEAN. I will not interrupt the Senator further, but I have considerable to say.

Mr. BORAH. I suspect so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I want to understand the Senator. Does the Senator mean that under the clause which he has just read the obligation rests upon the United States to defend South American countries or Latin American countries from invasion by some other country—some temporary intervention?

Mr. McLEAN. No, no. On the contrary——

Mr. KING. I ask because I do not think that is the Monroe doctrine at all.

Mr. McLEAN. On the contrary, my point is that the Secretary of State, in using the language which he did, implied a renunciation of our Monroe doctrine—implied that the right of self-defense in the future would go no further than the right to defend our territory from attack or invasion.

Mr. KING. I do not think his language is susceptible of that construction. I think the Senator from Idaho is right.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was not discussing the question of self-defense except incidentally, but I will refer to it again, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut. I repeat, the language which the Senator from Connecticut quoted was in a public address delivered by the Secretary of State before the American Society of International Law on the 28th day of April, 1928. Afterwards the Secretary of State transmitted that address to the powers with reference to this matter.

Mr. McLEAN. As a part of an official communication.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator. After having incorporated it in his letter, he then proceeded to restate it in the letter itself, aside from the address, and in the letter itself he states, as I have said, that "the right of self-defense is inherent in every sovereign state and implicit in every treaty. No specific reference to that inalienable attribute of sovereignty is therefore necessary or desirable."

That is the language of the Secretary of State in the letter itself. There are no limitations, and there is no specific reference to property or territory, but the general statement that the right of self-defense is inherent in every sovereign. That is his last and final statement, a statement which the Senator from Connecticut is unable to find or to read after it has been called to his attention.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Secretary of State stated in any of his correspondence or in any public address that the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine is a part of our system of self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. He stated that before the Committee on Foreign Relations and it has been published. Again, the Secretary of State, in another address, speaking on this same subject, said:

> The question was raised as to whether this treaty prevented a country from defending itself in the event of attack. It seemed to me incomprehensible that any nation should believe that a country should be deprived of its legitimate right of self-defense. No nation would sign a treaty expressly or clearly implying an obligation denying it the right to defend itself if attacked by any other country. I stated that this was a right inherent in every sovereign state and that it alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require resort to war in self-defense. If it has a good cause the world will applaud it and not condemn it.

Mr. JOHNSON. At this point, upon this subject, I would like a very brief elucidation, which may be reached, I think, by a question, if the Senator will permit me.

Suppose this treaty, in the opinion of the Senator, did not protect the Monroe doctrine, would the Senator favor, then, either a reservation or an explanatory clause that would afford that protection?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; if I did not believe that the Monroe doctrine was fully protected, I would not hesitate to join in a resolution that would accomplish that end.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator believes in the Monroe doctrine, does he not?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask that because the Senator's remark that he thought it had been wrenched far from its moorings. Nevertheless, in the doctrine in its pristine purity he believes?

Mr. BORAH. The doctrine as announced, I believe in, not as it has been too often misconstrued.

Mr. JOHNSON. Under the right of self-defense, every act that might be undertaken by this Nation under the Monroe doctrine could be undertaken with this treaty in full force and effect, is the position of the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is equally so, is it not, in respect to every other signatory to the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. With reference to the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I mean with reference to any right of self-defense.

Mr. BORAH. Unquestionably.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator not construe the British note as a reservation or a condition to the execution of this treaty?

Mr. BORAH. I construe the British note the same as I construe Mr. Kellogg's statement, as a construction of what the British understand the principle of self-defense to be under the treaty. They undertake to state what they conceive to be self-defense as applied, as they say, to their territory.

Mr. JOHNSON. Their intimation is, if I may use the expression, that they announce now a Monroe doctrine in reference to certain regions of the world, and that they will insist upon the execution of that doctrine so far as they are concerned. The Senator, of course, is much more familiar with the language than I am, but the British note says in so many words:

> It must be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty upon the distinct understanding that it does not prejudice their freedom of action in this respect.

That is, in relation to either interference with or attack upon the regions of the world in which Great Britain has an interest.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Or claims an interest.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes. Does not that language make this treaty dependent upon the condition that is thus written by Britain in reference to it?

Mr. BORAH. No; if I understand the Senator's question correctly. I do not understand that the British note changes the treaty in any respect whatever or gives Great Britain any other rights than Great Britain would have had had she never written the note.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not quarrel with the Senator's construction in the slightest degree in that regard, but some one in Great Britain, some statesmanlike mind, must have looked at the situation a little differently from the way in which we are now looking at it, because Britain writes, first, Britain's interest in certain regions of the world, and then writes distinctly that this treaty is executed upon the condition that Britain may act in reference to those regions of the world.

It is found on page 28, paragraph 10, of the Chamberlain note. The Senator is thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I have it here.

Mr. JOHNSON. So, what we pass here as being wholly unnecessary somebody there deemed to be of very grave importance. Is not that a fair inference?

Mr. BORAH. That is possibly a fair inference. The British Government deemed it important to make clear what they regarded as self-defense under the conditions of their far-flung territory.

In order that I may be distinctly understood, my contention is, Senator, that had she never written this note at all Great Britain would have had the same right that she would have under the note, because it was up to her all the time to construe the question of self-defense, and that is what she is doing in the note. It was up to her all the time to say what constituted self-defense in her mind, and that is what she did in the note.

If I may be permitted to pass in judgment upon the acts of such able men as the British Government had representing them in this matter, I think the position of the United States, if we are going to adopt a technical construction, is infinitely stronger than that of the British Government, because the British Government refers to certain regions, and afterwards in debate in the House of Commons undertakes to indicate those regions. If we should adopt a strict construction, they having named one proposition, the rule would exclude them from including others, while we are acting under a general principle and may adopt the principle of self-defense anywhere, or under any circumstances, or in any region where we regard it as necessary for our safety.

Mr. JOHNSON. The point I was trying to suggest was this, not that the Senator's construction is at all erroneous, but that it was deemed essential by the British, in order to exercise hereafter what he terms the right of self-defense, specifically to designate it and to make as a condition precedent to the execution of this treaty the reservation of that right. So that they disagree, I think, with the view that we may have in regard to the breadth of the right of self-defense.

The language of that section the Senator read yesterday, but I recall it to him by simply saying, realize the indefiniteness of it, first, then the utter clarity and emphasis with which the British Government reserves its rights.

> There are certain regions of the world the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety. His Majesty's Government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions can not be suffered. Their protection against attack is to the British Empire a measure of self-defense. It must be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty upon the distinct understanding that it does not prejudice their freedom of action in this respect.

If we had the same view that is apparent here, we, too, would sign this treaty upon the distinct understanding that the regions in which we are interested should always be subject to our right of self-defense, if we use that term, or subject to such peculiar rules or regulations or policies as we might have in respect to those regions. I was merely calling the attention of the Senator to the difference between the attitude we take here and the attitude that obviously was taken by the British in this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that same connection will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. BORAH. Will not the Senator permit me to answer the Senator from California so that I may keep order between the different parts of the Chamber?

The Senator from California has stated that the British Government deemed it important to make this statement as an expression of its idea of what constituted self-defense, and that it signs the treaty with the distinct understanding that in that respect it will exercise the right of self-defense.

We sign this treaty with the distinct understanding, so expressed by the Secretary of State, that we will exercise the right of self-defense according to our judgment and according to our discretion. There is no difference between the two propositions. Let me read what the Secretary said.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, before the Senator reads that, the Senator from California has added tremendously to our conception of the Monroe doctrine and to the pending treaty by saying that the treaty would be signed subject to any rules or regulations this Government may make with respect to the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator may omit "rules and regulations," if he desires. Call it the Monroe doctrine alone.

Mr. GLASS. I wanted the Senator from California to omit "rules and regulations."

Mr. JOHNSON. It is of no consequence.

Mr. GLASS. That takes in a very wide scope.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is it that the British exception takes in? Is the Senator aware?

Mr. GLASS. I think it is a British Monroe doctrine.

Mr. JOHNSON. A British Monroe doctrine, not expressed at all, or expressed in the most general terms.

Mr. BORAH. It could not be any more general than the Monroe doctrine in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Just one moment. I want to carry along this discussion with a degree of connectedness, if possible.

The same authority that wrote this note, the same representative of the British Government, in discussing this matter in the House of Commons, said this:

> The honorable gentleman found fault with the wording of my note with respect to the passage dealing with self-defense. He appeared to think that that was something which I had added, and that it had no parallel in the American note.

Then he said:

> I venture to think that it does no good to put about those exaggerated suspicions, and that it will be much more helpful to say, what is the fact, that our doctrine is exactly comparable to that of the American Government, that it is not a doctrine of aggression, that it is not a desire for territorial expan-

sion, but a pure measure in self-defense necessitated by the geographical position of the Empire.

It is just the same proposition, in my judgment. Great Britain would not be stretching the principle of self-defense in defending those regions of country any more than we would be stretching the principle of self-defense if we should undertake to defend Patagonia against some foreign power.

It would be just as difficult—yes; far more difficult—to associate the conditions in Patagonia with the welfare and peace and safety of the United States than it would to associate the regions around the Suez Canal with the safety and security of the British Empire. I can well imagine, as can the Senator, that if the British Empire were in a controversy with a certain great power in Europe and they should begin to maneuver in the region which is designated by Sir Austen Chamberlain or in the region of the Suez Canal, it would be regarded as a menace to the British Empire. It would be taking possession of a part of the territory which, if in the possession of the enemy, would make it impossible for the British Empire to conduct connectedly her military affairs. So, as I see it, there is no difference in the two propositions whatever.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am not arguing that there is any difference in the two propositions.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have asked the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. BORAH. I beg the Senator to let me conclude this proposition before I yield to anyone else.

Mr. JOHNSON. Just let me finish this colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, and then I shall yield with apologies to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Let us concede there is no difference in the two propositions. That was not the point I had in mind when I rose and questioned the Senator. Britain felt it necessary to state that position accurately. Is it the Senator's position that our country has up to this time accurately stated its position as well?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is exactly my position.

Mr. JOHNSON. And that that occurs in the Kellogg note and the Kellogg speeches?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it is stated in the Kellogg note and in the Kellogg speeches, and aside from that, in my judgment, it would have been the same, so far as execution of the treaty is concerned, if neither one of the parties had ever written a line about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then is the Senator's position that it is inherent in the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. Safer there than it could ever be under a reservation, for there it is inherent and inalienable.

Mr. JOHNSON. And required no statement either by Britain or the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. But that both countries have stated with exactness so far as our doctrine is concerned, their position?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I think I am under obligation to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who rose a few moments ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the same connection to which reference has been made by the Senator from California, after Sir Austen Chamberlain stated the position with reference to certain regions of the world, he had this to say:

> The Government of the United States have comparable interests, any disregard of which by a foreign power they have declared that they would regard as an unfriendly act.

Of course, he refers there to the Monroe doctrine. It seems from the correspondence that the British Government felt itself obligated, in the interest of fairness and honorable dealing with all of the signatories to this treaty, to serve notice upon them that in the application of the treaty hereafter it would regard itself as bound to protect the various regions to which reference is made. Sir Austen seems to make an effort to link it up with the Monroe doctrine. In the reply of the Secretary of State no reference is made to that suggestion of Great Britain and no reference is made to the various regions. Secretary Kellogg does not either confirm or deny the right of the British Government to take that attitude with reference to the treaty. Neither does he deny nor confirm the inference made by Sir Austen Chamberlain with reference to the Monroe doctrine.

Does the Senator from Idaho attach any importance to the fact that the Secretary of State in all this correspondence makes no mention whatever of this particular doctrine of the United States? While he discusses in general terms the right of self-defense and leaves each nation to determine when that right shall be exercised and in what part of the world, he seems to avoid any discussion of the question either through fear that it might be Pandora's box which might embarrass the Nation or because of some other reason. I would like to inquire of the Senator if he thinks any importance is to be attached to the fact that our Secretary of State enters into no discussion of that question at all in any of the correspondence between himself and the other side?

Mr. BORAH. The reason why the Secretary did not, as I understand—and I am quite sure I am correct—is that the Secretary of State stated the principle of self-defense, that it was inherent, as I said, and could not be denied to a sovereign power; that it was implicit in the treaty, and that he regarded and does regard the Monroe doctrine as much a part of our self-defense at the protection of any part of our territory, or any other interest.

Mr. BARKLEY. It might have been a little more illuminating if in connection with the British note there had been some reference to it so we might have avoided the apprehension that some Senators now seem to feel.

Mr. BORAH. Of course that is true; that is to say, as we look back over the correspondence in this way we can see things that might have been done to make it more explicit. But I want to say for the Secretary of State, that he brought this treaty before the Committee on Foreign Relations as it was proposed by Briand. Throughout voluminous correspondence running over a year he held the treaty to the exact words as it came to us in the first instance. He declined in different ways to accede to suggestions, and maintained the treaty as it was originally proposed. Mr. President, the reason why he did not mention the Monroe doctrine, or one reason at least, was because he has always taken the position that there was no occasion for mentioning it in view of the fact that the Monroe doctrine is a part of our self-defense.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to say that that is the only reason why the Monroe doctrine was not mentioned?

Mr. BORAH. I said that was one of the reasons and, in my opinion, in the first instance the controlling reason.

Mr. REED. I would not want to concede that that was the only reason, because I think there was another very material reason that I do not want to go into at this moment. I do not think there will be any dispute between the Senator and myself as to the facts if it becomes necessary to state them.

Mr. BORAH. No; there will be no dispute, in my judgment, between the Senator and myself as to the facts. There may be a difference of view as to the inferences to be drawn from them.

Mr. BLAINE. In connection with the very matter which the Senator from Idaho is discussing, I want to call his attention to what appears to be a sort of double-barreled proposition on the part of the British Government. Our Secretary of State, in all of his diplomatic notes and different speeches, has referred to the subject of self-defense generally. He did so in his final note of June 23, 1928, and so treated it in the first numbered paragraph of that note. The British Government prior to that, on May 19, must have had a different conception of the question of self-defense than had our Secretary of State, for in the British note of May 19 Chamberlain first takes out the question of general self-defense or self-defense in general and in paragraph 4 of his note had this to say:

> After studying the wording of article 1 of the United States draft, His

Majesty's Government do not think that its terms exclude action which a State may be forced to take in self-defense. Mr. Kellogg has made it clear in the speech to which I have referred above that he regards the right of self-defense as inalienable, and His Majesty's Government are disposed to think that on this question no addition to the text is necessary.

Then under paragraph 10 of the same note Chamberlain engrafts upon the subject and upon the treaty a new proposition.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAINE. At least the British Government must have conceived the situation to be that the general discussion on the question of self-defense was not sufficient, and therefore proposed to make a special exception in reference to the formula or policy concerning self-defense. Since the British Government concedes that the definitions applied by our Secretary of State and himself in the diplomatic notes was not sufficient to be all inclusive of the right of self-defense, why should not the United States also follow the very assumption of the British Government and engraft upon the treaty an interpretation with respect to the Monroe doctrine and its application?

Mr. BORAH. I think I have made myself as clear as I can upon that proposition. I will repeat, however, that in my opinion the British Government was seeking to do nothing more than by way of illustration to state its conception of self-defense under the treaty. It would have had just the same freedom had it never said anything.

Mr. BRUCE. May I ask the Senator just a single question, because I want to understand clearly his position? As I understand, the position of the Senator is that it makes no difference whether Great Britain asked for any such reservation or not, and it makes no difference whether we make any reservation with regard to the Monroe doctrine, because whatever any nation under this treaty chooses to call self-defense is, for the purposes of the treaty, self-defense.

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly, and that is the reason why these technical discussions in the Senate will never be of any practical value when the exigency arises. Each nation will determine for itself, under the circumstances as they arise and the conditions which are presented, what it conceives to be self-defense. As I said yesterday, undoubtedly that is regarded by men, and by the able Senator from Maryland in all probability, as a great weakness of the treaty. I regard it as a weakness inherent in human nature of any condition which I know of no way at this time to obviate. I know of no way by which to take away from a nation the right of self-defense.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely want to say that, as I interpret the Senator's position, the treaty neither enlarges nor restricts the right of national self-defense.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. GEORGE. It neither enlarges nor restricts nor in any way amends the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question? As I understand the Senator from Idaho he goes further and expresses the opinion that if any effort had been made to define what constituted self-defense such limitation would leave a decision more contracted than it is under the terms of the treaty? In other words, any limitation would naturally place a nation in the position that it must remain within the limitation?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly. If you would undertake to define self-defense what would you say? That it was the right to defend yourself.

Mr. BORAH. The Supreme Court of the United States has always very carefully refused to undertake to define "due process of law," and I think it would be just as difficult to define self-defense. Such a definition would amount to absolutely nothing until the facts in a particular case were known.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator contend that the right of self-defense covers our right to protect our citizens and their property in whatsoever part of the world they may be?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I stated that on yesterday. But that right may also be invoked under another principle.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it the Senator's understanding that the letters that have passed between the Secretary of State and various foreign countries become, with the signature of the treaty, the common understanding of the signatories as to what the treaty means?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; written interpretations of the treaty. France and Great Britain, and I think also Germany referred to their notes as interpretations—not as reservations but as interpretations—of the treaty. That is all they are. The signatories could have just as easily made the interpretations afterwards as before.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho another question. Those interpretations of the treaty were accepted by all who signed the treaty? Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. BORAH. No; the interpretations of Great Britain, for instance, were not accepted by some of those who adhered to the treaty.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator understand that they are accepted by us?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, as we construe them. Great Britain was doing nothing more than interpreting her idea of self-defense, and we accept her construction of it; that is, the construction that she decides for herself and determines for herself what is self-defense. That was in the treaty, anyway.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then, if I may ask the Senator another question, at some time in the future if a controversy should arise, and the treaty should have to be interpreted, is it the Senator's understanding that the parties to the controversy would be forced to go back to the official interpretation given to the treaty before it was signed in order to apply the treaty to the future controversy?

Mr. BORAH. The treaty would be applied to the future controversy; in other words, in my opinion, these notes do not add anything to the treaty nor take anything from the treaty. Therefore, when we come to apply the treaty or to interpret the treaty upon a state of facts we shall have to go to the treaty.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator mean the treaty exclusive of the notes?

Mr. BORAH. Absolutely. Do not understand that I contend that a treaty might not be modified by notes, but what I contend is that the notes referred to did not undertake to modify the pending treaty. They simply placed a construction upon the treaty which anyone accepts, because it is in the treaty itself, and would have been there had the notes never been written.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As I understand, the Senator's point of view, he regards these notes as being a part of the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not in the sense in which I think the Senator is now asking the question. I regard these notes in the light of the fact that they add nothing to the treaty nor take anything from the treaty as having no legal effect whatsoever.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The notes are a part of the treaty without adding anything to it or taking anything from it.

Mr. BORAH. I say that the notes are interpretative.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; and are official because they were accepted by those who signed the treaty? Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. BORAH. No. In other words, when the Senator says "accepted" he means accepted in the sense that there resulted a different understanding of the treaty than it would have had if the notes had not been written. Of course, we accepted the notes, we received them, but we did not in any way modify our views as to the treaty, and the notes did not modify the treaty. Therefore, when it is undertaken to interpret the treaty in the future, it will be interpreted just as if the notes had never been written. I take that position, and I want it to be distinctly understood.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question of the Senator for the sake of clearing up a little difficulty which I have in understanding this problem. In November, 1850, we signed a commercial treaty with Switzerland and certain notes passed in connection with that treaty. They were not physically a part of the treaty which was signed but certain interpretative notes passed between the two Govern-

ments. No controversy arose until 1898 when Switzerland came with certain claims.

The United States Government replied that the claims were contrary to the established policy of the Government of the United States. The Swiss Government referred the Government of the United States to the interpretative notes which had passed prior to the signature of the treaty. When that fact was called to the attention of John Hay, he immediately capitulated and said that justice and honor demanded that the interpretation of the treaty at the time it was signed would have to govern action under the treaty in 1898. Now I want to know if the Senator draws a line of distinction between the notes passed in 1850 between the Government of the United States and the Government of Switzerland and the notes which have passed in the negotiation of the pending treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Not at all. I am familiar in a general way with the incident to which the Senator refers, and I do not draw any distinction as to the reception of the notes, but in the Swiss incident there was an interpretation placed upon the treaty different from what the interpretation of the treaty would have been had the notes not been written. I want to make my contention plain. I do not contend, as I have said over and over again, that the interpretation of a treaty may not be changed by a note or notes, but what I contend in this instance is it has not been done, because the governments responsible for the notes have said nothing in the notes that is not in the treaty without the notes. If they had made some statement in their notes which was not contained in the treaty, under a fair interpretation of it, the Senator would have his Swiss case, but that is not this instance. For example, let me ask the Senator a question: Suppose in the future the question should arise as to what constituted self-defense in a particular transaction, what possible light would the statement of Mr. Kellogg throw upon the treaty, what possible light would the statement in the English note throw upon the treaty, when both of them do nothing more than confirm the proposition that each nation has a right for itself to determine what is self-defense?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And within that right to determine that wars conducted by the League of Nations come within the right of self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly, if the facts and conditions are such as to reach this treaty.

Mr. BLAINE. Is it the Senator's conception that when America adheres to this treaty, if we shall adhere, that action is a recognition of the claim of the British Government under paragraph 10 of the British note of May 19, 1928?

Mr. BORAH. It is a recognition of the right of the British Government to construe the doctrine of self-defense to apply to any territory which she conceives it to be necessary to apply it for protection.

Mr. BLAINE. Then, it is a recognition that Great Britain may extend any doctrine she may pronounce to any portion of the world in which she has a special interest?

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly. She has the right to make the construction; whether the public opinion of the world would sustain her may be a different thing.

Mr. BLAINE. And that we recognize that from the beginning of this treaty?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. We recognize it by this treaty, and we would recognize it if the British Government had pursued the policy of remaining silent and signing the treaty without a word.

Mr. BLAINE. Is it not a fact that the American Monroe doctrine was never recognized by any document or by any diplomatic note by any government until the recognition in the covenant of the League of Nations?

Mr. BORAH. I believe so; but we are neither recognizing nor refusing to recognize the Monroe doctrine here; we are recognizing the doctrine of self-defense, and in the doctrine of self-defense is included the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. BLAINE. So that any nation can give justification to its acts by sanctifying that act as an act of self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. As I said yesterday, that may be regarded by some as the weakness of this treaty; we have got to leave it to each signatory of the treaty to determine for itself what is self-defense. It may construe the treaty out of all reason, and there is no one to censor it except the public opinion of the world. I know of no way to curtail that right. I would not any more take it away from Great Britain with her world-wide territories than I would take it away from the United States. Great Britain must be the judge, and she must answer to the conscience of the world whether she has acted in good faith in construing it. There is no superior court or other tribunal to which appeal can be made except the judgment of the world.

Mr. BLAINE. Let us assume a situation that might well occur: India, having something over 300,000,000 subjects, under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the British Government, might assert her independence and the American Government might find itself in a situation whereby it would be to its advantage and that of civilization to take a certain course in connection with that assertion of independence by the people of India which would in effect border upon an act of war. Are we not by this treaty recognizing that we have no right to do that; that we must first submit the case to some tribunal, some organization for a pacific settlement; and are we not binding ourselves against any act in reference to the possible independence of the nations that are now under the British dominion?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Indian Government should undertake to establish its independence, undoubtedly the British Government under this treaty would have a right to pursue such course as would retain the Indian Government under British dominion; and the United States would have no right whatever to interfere in that matter. She has not now any right to do so.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Some of the passages that have taken place might possibly lead to the conclusion that if Great Britain waged any kind of a war, and claimed to be doing it in self-defense, the other nations signatory to the treaty would be estopped from asserting that she was not acting in self-defense.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly. For instance, when the situation arises and the conditions are presented, and Great Britain acts upon the theory of self-defense, the United States is not bound to accept Great Britain's judgment. We may freely disagree with that proposition. The whole world may freely disagree with it. She may be morally condemned for any such course, and likely would be if it did not meet with the ordinary principles of self-defense. The treaty does not involve us in a combine to approve what any particular signatory of the treaty says is self-defense; but if they act upon it and violate the treaty, we are relieved from the obligations of the treaty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask the question because in one of the articles introduced in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] the statement is made that we sanction any war in which Great Britain may choose to engage. I should like to have the views of the Senator from Idaho on that subject.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I have read that article. I really do not know upon what theory that assertion is made. We do not sanction any war, Mr. President. The very object and purpose of this treaty, the fundamental principle upon which it is written and rests, is to condemn all war, to reject force in the settlement of international affairs. By no possible construction can it be said that we have sanctioned any war either that Great Britain may wage or that any other country may wage. We do not sanction any war that the league may wage.

We do not sanction the use of force anywhere. If Senators will read this treaty, and take the treaty for what it says and not what it has been asserted that it says, they will come to the conclusion that there is just one fundamental principle in the treaty, and that is a solemn pledge upon the part of these nations, representing now practically all the inhabitants of the earth, that they will not seek other methods than peaceful methods for the settlement of their controversies.

It may be said that that is not much. I think it is a stupen-

dous fact. I think the fact that 60 nations, representing the inhabitants of the earth, can be drawn together in a solemn pledge, backed by the conscience and the moral forces of their people, that henceforth they will pursue no course save that of peace, is a stupendous fact. We have been so thoroughly saturated, however, with the idea that there is nothing in international affairs save force, that we can give no credence to anything save that which is backed by an army and a navy.

I undertake to assert that the greatest factor in international affairs today is the moral forces of the masses of mankind; and this is an attempt to mobilize those forces.

Mr. FESS. Has there ever been an attempt in international law to define self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. No; not to define it. A great many international-law writers say that the right of self-defense among nations is as inherent and inalienable as the right of self-defense among individuals.

Mr. FESS. The omission of it in this treaty is not due to a desire to avoid it; but it is difficult to define.

Mr. BORAH. You could not define it. Suppose you attempted to define self-defense as to yourself; what would it be? The right to defend yourself. Suppose a nation undertook to define self-defense: It is the right of the nation to defend itself.

Mr. FESS. That is the reason why we leave it to each individual nation to determine what self-defense is.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. FESS. And, while that is the weakness of the treaty, it cannot be corrected.

Mr. BORAH. I have said that some will regard it as the weakness of the treaty, and of course it is, from one viewpoint. From another viewpoint it is the strength of the treaty.

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I understand, the whole idea of the treaty is to arbitrate everything.

Mr. BORAH. Not to arbitrate, but to settle through peaceful means. The controversy may be settled through diplomatic methods or any other method of peaceful settlement.

Mr. TYDINGS. But, at the same time, I think the treaty would give any nation which was a party to it the right of self-defense before it was asked to arbitrate the matter or settle it through peaceful channels, if that nation saw fit to settle it by the exercise of the right of self-defense.

Mr. BLAINE. Assuming that paragraph 10 of the British note had been the declared British policy prior to our American Revolution, could Lafayette have come to America under the circumstances that he did, and could Franklin have gone to France under the circumstances that he did, without having involved France in war with the British Government?

Mr. BORAH. Lafayette got to America by stealing away from the espionage of his king. Lafayette did not come here by authority of the French Government or by authority of anybody that would be bound by a treaty. Lafayette stole away, and came here in the first instance really as a fugutive from his government, because his government was not willing for him to come. So that the illustration is not, in my judgment, applicable, because he was not representing any government which would have been bound by a treaty.

Mr. BLAINE. I associated Franklin with the acts of Lafayette. Franklin did not steal his way into France, and when he reached France he was not there regarded as a criminal nor a fugitive; and France did certain acts—not only the French citizens, but, as well, the French Government—acts that today would be regarded as hostile acts; acts that in my opinion would have involved France in war if paragraph 10 of the British note had been the declared policy of the British Government.

Mr. BORAH. In my opinion, the treaty would not have any application to the Franklin episode at all, and very little to the Indian episode; because if India should undertake to establish her independence, and should proceed to the point where she was sending representatives to other governments and seeking to establish diplomatic relations with the other governments, the Government of the United States, under this treaty, would have the right to exercise its discretion as to whether the time had arrived under international law when it could justly recognize that government and receive its ambassadors; and this treaty would not have the slightest effect upon it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I suggest, somewhat in line with the inquiry by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] as to whether a country signing the treaty would be obliged to resort to pacific means before exercising the right of self-defense, that it would depend altogether upon the circumstances and the facts; would it not?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. If one government actually attacked another, that government would have the right to defend itself without any diplomatic exchanges.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely. I perhaps misunderstood the Senator, but the Senator's interpretation is undoubtedly correct. It would depend entirely upon the circumstances. If the United States or any other Government was attacked, of course, it would have the right to invoke the principle of self-defense instantly, because that is what self-defense is.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will yield, the point I was trying to bring out was that the right of self-defense is paramount to every other right or statement in the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Whenever the facts put it into operation.

Mr. President, I was discussing the Monroe doctrine when the principle of self-defense was again brought into the discussion; and notwithstanding it will be somewhat disconnected, I think I ought to put into the RECORD some excerpts in regard to the Monroe doctrine as it relates to the question of self-defense.

Mr. Root, in the Journal of International Law in July, 1914, says:

> The doctrine is not international law, but it rests upon the right of self-protection; and that right is recognized by international law. The right is a necessary corollary of independent sovereignty. It is well understood that the exercise of the right of self-protection may, and frequently does, extend in its effect beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of the State exercising it. . . . Since the Monroe doctrine is a declaration based upon this Nation's right of self-protection, it can not be transmuted into a joint, or common, declaration by American States, or any number of them.

Again, he says:

> It is to be observed that in reference to the South American governments, as in all other respects, the international right upon which the declaration expressly rests is not sentiment or sympathy or a claim to dictate what kind of government any other country shall have, but the safety of the United States. It is because the new governments can not be overthrown by the allied powers "without endangering our peace and happiness" that "the United States can not behold such interposition in any form with indifference."

Mr. Cleveland, in his message in 1895, said, speaking with reference to the Monroe doctrine:

> The doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinct form of government.

That is the well-stated, briefly stated, succinctly stated principle of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would it interrupt the Senator if I called his attention to the fact that the British minister, in the notes discussing the Venezuelan controversy, or at least in his public statements, declared that the Monroe doctrine was a bit of American impudence, and that it never had been recognized?

Mr. BORAH. There have been Englishmen who transgressed the laws of propriety, as well as other people. They are liable to do that over there, as we are over here, but we do not pay much attention to it. We go ahead and maintain the Monroe doctrine. Now, it has come to have considerable respect over there. They mention it in their note here. Abraham Lincoln once said that the most sublime virtue which a public man could possess was patience, and I think that will apply to nations as well. We have been patient until the time has come when everybody recognizes that the Monroe doctrine is a part of our national safety, and they respect it. In my opinion there would not be any more danger of a foreign government challenging that doctrine than there would be of their making an attack upon us.

Mr. Buchanan said in 1848:

> The highest and first duty of every independent nation is to provide for its own safety and acting upon this principle we should be compelled to resist the acquisition of Cuba by any powerful maritime state with all means which Providence has placed at our command.

Prof. Bushnell Hart, in his treatise on the Monroe doctrine,

after speaking of the changes and different interpretations of the Monroe doctrine, said:

> There are two fundamental principles to which all agree. The first is that the doctrine has always been, and now is, directed primarily to the defense and welfare of the United States; and secondarily, to the defense and welfare of other American states.

Professor Callihan, quoted by Professor Hart, says:

> It may be fitly called the doctrine of national defense, which in its results may be regarded also as a doctrine of Pan American defense.

Professor Woolsey says:

> There are now three fundamental principles which characterize the policy of President Monroe as it was and as it is. First, the Monroe doctrine was a statement of policy originated and maintained by reason of self-interest, not of altruism. Second, it was justifiable by reason of the right of self-defense (which is a recognized principle of international law). Third, it called no new rights into being, therefore, whenever it oversteps the principle of self-defense reasonably interpreted, the right disappears and the policy is questionable because it then violates the rights of others. . . . The Monroe doctrine is based upon the right of self-defense. This is the first law of nations as of individuals.

I think the statement of Professor Woolsey is an exceedingly illuminating one.

> It called no new rights into being; therefore whenever it oversteps the principle of self-defense reasonably interpreted, the right disappears and the policy is questionable.

Frederick Coudert, the great lawyer, said:

> In its essence the doctrine was merely one of safety for the United States. Its germ is contained in Washington's Farewell Address. Experience has shown that every European war involved a struggle between the various colonial possessions of the contestants, and the doctrine of hands off on this continent was nothing more than a necessary measure of safety.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In that connection, will the Senator permit me to read a single paragraph from the celebrated Olney letter on Venezuela?

Mr. BORAH. I am very glad to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And another paragraph, in view of the remark just made by the Senator from Missouri, as follows:

> That the rule thus defined—

That is, the Monroe doctrine—

> has been the accepted public law of this country ever since its promulgation can not fairly be denied. Its pronouncement by the Monroe administration at that particular time was unquestionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain, who at once gave to it an open and unqualified adhesion which has never been withdrawn.

I call attention to this:

> But the rule was decided upon and formulated by the Monroe administration as a distinctively American doctrine of great import to the safety and welfare of the United States after the most careful consideration by a Cabinet which numbered among its members John Quincy Adams, Calhoun, Crawford, and Wirt, and which before acting took both Jefferson and Madison into its councils.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator. Now, Mr. President, could the Monroe doctrine rest upon any more secure basis than that of self-defense, when we recognize that principle as inherent not only in this treaty but in all treaties, inherent in the nations, and inalienable; and also recognize that we are the sole judges of what constitutes our security, our safety, and our self-defense? No reservation, no resolution, no specification, could make it more secure, more within the protection of our Government, than to treat it as what it is, an essential part of our self-defense, and thereby protected by the inalienable right of self-defense.

Mr. President, yesterday when the interrogatories were first submitted which led us into another field of discussion I was discussing the question of implied sanctions under this treaty. I do not feel, notwithstanding I have taken entirely too much time of the Senate, that I ought to leave that subject what I deem to be somewhat incomplete, and I will be as brief in regard to it as I may.

I called attention yesterday to the fact that there are no sanctions to be implied from the language of the treaty itself; that is, no implied obligation to use force, or to enforce the treaty against a nation which should see fit to violate it.

I called attention further to the fact that nowhere in the correspondence, in the numerous notes between the different governments, the governments which afterwards adhered to the treaty, has there been any indication, so far as I find, of any implication, that there are any sanctions expressed or implied in the treaty.

I also called attention to numerous statements, among others the statement of Lord Cushendun, at the time of the signing of the treaty, Lord Grey, and others, to the effect that there were no sanctions, express or implied.

It has been said, however, that we do not, in case the treaty is violated, join with the other nations in punishing the violator of the treaty, the European powers will have a chance to charge bad faith; in other words, it is said that Europe looks upon this treaty as one providing for implied sanctions, and that we will be expected to maintain it as against those who disregard it. I do not know of any expression of that kind upon the part of any responsible party in Europe. If any such statement has been made, it has escaped my rather vigilant observations in regard to this matter.

I do know that numerous statements by those in authority, and by the leading press of foreign countries, have been to the very opposite effect, and in my opinion there is no misunderstanding whatever in England, in France, or anywhere in Europe, as to just exactly what this treaty means, with reference to sanctions. There is no understanding that the United States, for instance, is under any obligation whatever to use force or to maintain by force the treaty. The other nations understand perfectly that it is a voluntary obligation, binding upon each nation in so far as it respects its obligation, to settle its controversies in a peaceful way; that if any nation disregards the treaty, it steps out from under the treaty, and the treaty is at an end with reference to all other nations so far as that nation violating the treaty is concerned.

I want to read here a statement of Premier Baldwin which I think is a most remarkable statement when one comes to analyze it and consider the implications of it. It was made on November 8, 1928. Speaking with reference to this treaty, he said:

> Believe me, the alternative before us in Europe is very simple and the choice ought to be easy. We must either keep faith with the spirit of the pact that we have signed or in time we must go down the steep place together like the Gadarene swine, and perish eternally.

Talk about sanctions for a treaty; there is no sanction for a treaty, after all, but what the nation conceives to be its interest. That is, at last, the only sanction. It does not make any difference what you agree to, you must test it at last by what the signatories to the treaty, when their exigency arises, conceive to be necessary to their interest, to their protection, to their preservation, or to their welfare.

I think, as the Premier clearly indicated, Europe has arrived at the point where she believes that the war system means the destruction of European civilization; that if we can not find some way to settle international controversies other than by force of arms the civilization of Europe will give way, cave in, break down. Self-preservation has become the one powerful function for this treaty. The war system is undermining civilization, bringing ruin and misery to millions, and the only hope is the policy embodied in this treaty. Here is the strength and the worth and the function for this treaty. Sink or swim, live or die, something like this treaty is the only way of escape from the impending doom.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho, then, why is it that these European nations keep on arming? Mussolini has just told us that bayonets and cannons are steadily increasing in Europe. Lloyd George has lately sounded a note of warning to the same effect. At present one-sixth of the entire aggregate income of the world is devoted to the maintenance of armies and navies, and there is one soldier for every 300 civilians throughout the world. I do not see any indication that those moral forces upon which the Senator is so strongly disposed to rely are as powerful as he seems to think that they are, or that Europe is as anxious for peace as he supposes it to be. It seems to me that the Senator forgets that a nation, when it signs a treaty, may have one conception of its self-interest and then a little later on find that it has made a mistake and form another conception of its self-interest.

We all know that in 1839 Germany thought that it was to its interest as well as to the interest of Europe generally that

it should guarantee the neutrality of Belgium. Yet in 1914 she changed her view and hewed and burned her way with sword and fire over the soil of Belgium to France. Before the World War Italy thought that it was to her interest to enter into the tripartite treaty with Austria and Germany. Yet when the crucial time came for the performance of her obligations she aligned herself with the Allies and with us and not with Austria and Germany. So I say that it seems to me that trust in the mere enlightened self-interest of a country for the purposes of peace is an unreliable thing.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator is explaining now just exactly what I stated—that in the last analysis it is self-interest that controls. He has just stated that at one time they thought it was to their interest to do one thing, and at another time that it was to their interest to do another thing, and, of course, that is true. So I repeat that the Senator is quite in accord with what I stated a moment ago—that in the last analysis it is in response to what the nation conceives to be necessary to its self-preservation or to its self-interest that it will act.

Then what I say in addition to that is that Europe has come to the conclusion that self-preservation—that its deepest and most permanent and profound self-interest—is to get rid of war and of armaments and to pursue a course which this treaty points out.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask the Senator, has Europe arrived at any such point? If so, why is it that we find it impossible to reach any sort of permanent agreement with Great Britain, one of the most enlightened and highly civilized countries in the world, with regard to a proper naval ratio? Practically every effort since the League of Nations was established to bring about a disarmament of the nations of the world has proved abortive.

The Senator may have different ideas about peace from mine, but I do not see on just what rainbow of real hope his eyes are fixed.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator's idea of peace is fixed upon the proposition which is now sinking Europe to the bottomless pit.

Mr. BRUCE. My idea of peace is that it is a thing that to exist must be commended.

Mr. BORAH. Just as the Kaiser thought that the only thing was force, that the only thing that people respected was armies and navies, and the Senator sees where they landed.

Mr. BRUCE. Still the Senator does not think that the peace of a city could be preserved without the backing of force, does he?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think so; but the application of that proposition to individuals within a State which has the power to enforce is a wholly different proposition than undertaking to enforce the same proposition between nations because, as I said a while ago, we can not find a superpower to do it. The distinction between individuals and communities, between individuals and sovereign states in the application of force, wise men have long since recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. I admit that it is a more difficult thing to police international peace than to police the peace of a city or the peace of a single State of the Union or the peace of the United States. But it seems to me that just because it is more difficult it is an idle dream to believe that the peace of cities has to be policed, that the peace of a single State of the Union has to be policed, and that the peace of the United States has to be policed, but that yet the peace of the world need not be policed. The Senator would rely upon nothing but the interchange of one vain empty promise for another without any sanction to enforce either.

Mr. BORAH. The Sentator from Maryland ought to have been general counsel for the German general staff, not the German people but the general staff.

Mr. BRUCE. No; I would much prefer to be counsel for our own Government or for the Government of the Kingdom of Great Britain which, notwithstanding the fact that it is actuated to an extraordinary degree by principles of good sense and good feeling in its international relations, yet has the prudence to keep its powder dry and to maintain not only for the preservation of the liberties of the English people but for the progress of human civilization itself throughout the world a fully adequate army and navy.

Mr. BORAH. I want to recall again the language of Premier Baldwin, because he is now giving an able illustration of the fruits of the policy and the system which the able Senator from Maryland has been eulogizing. It is true that the British Empire has endeavored through the years to keep its powder dry and to keep up its armies and its navies, and today it is loaded with a superhuman debt, with millions of people out of employment, adding still millions more in the way of armament, and this is what Premier Baldwin said the near future seems to have in store:

> Believe me, the alternative before us in Europe is very simple and the choice ought to be easy. We must either keep faith with the spirit of the pact that we have signed or in time we must go down the steep place together like the Gadarene swine and perish eternally.

That is the Dantean hell toward which all are tending under this doctrine of force as the sole preserver of peace.

> Let us all tonight, and there are representatives here of many great powers, accept this opportunity which has been given to us for a new start and go forward with new faith and with new hope. I believe the time may come when in the histories of this period there will be no greater act credited to the United States than this, that in this year she had the high honor in voicing the aspirations and desire of mankind in presenting that pact to the nations for signature.
>
> Only let us remember what it is we have signed. It is so tremendous a thing that few of us realize it, and the result of every signature will be nothing unless the nations, realizing to what they are committed, make up their minds their signatures shall be honored to the end of time.

I do not know, and of course no man knows, whether this treaty will long be kept. All laws, whether enacted by man or promulgated by God, are made with the possibility of being broken and shattered; but I do believe, Mr. President, as the British Premier so well said, that if we can not find a means by which to adjust international affairs other than that of relying upon the Army and the Navy, if we can not find a method through peaceful means or through peaceful ways to adjust our controversies, civilization is imperiled as it was just prior to or in the coming of the Dark Ages.

Mr. FESS. In the judgment of the Senator will the operation of this treaty open the way for further limitation of armament in time to come?

Mr. BORAH. I sincerely believe so.

Mr. FESS. It would appear to me that would be one of the main objects of the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. That is a main object of the treaty and yet, after all, we have got to have a different psychology in international affairs, because if we did not have armies and navies and if we had this war psychology, they would fight with their fists. We have got to create a faith in peaceful methods for the adjustment of international affairs. We have got to instill into the masses of the people and they in turn into their representatives and leaders the belief that war is a futile thing, that, after all, things are never settled until they are settled right, and force seldom takes into consideration the question of right, and therefore it is to their interest to have a more peaceful way of adjusting their controversies.

This treaty has been made in the open light of day. It is the first great treaty of the kind in which the correspondence was carried on public. Back of it stands the mass convictions of the great people of the different nations, and in my opinion, it is working that change in the viewpoint of the nations with reference to the possibility of settling their difficulties which is essential to peace. I hope, of course, that that will be followed, and I believe it will be followed, by disarmament to a marked degree, but disarmament is only, after all, a part and a small part of the question of bringing peace to the nations. I think the question of disarmament is infinitely more important as an economic question because it is now literally burying the people of Europe under supertax burdens that will in time of peace destroy the manhood and womanhood of Europe, and in a longer time other countries, and therefore every step we can take in that direction is not only calculated to make war less

liable, but it is infinitely more calculated to rehabilitate the manhood and womanhood of those countries.

Mr. FESS. I was greatly impressed with what the Senator said a moment ago about the moral forces that are vastly more important than we think. It would appear to me that if this treaty would give full play to the moral forces of the world, we may present a public feeling that will lead to disarmament. I had thought that was one of the strong features of the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. It is an important feature.

Mr. Phillip Kerr, who is a distinguished gentleman, intimately associated with Lloyd George during the war, and deeply interested in the cause of peace, speaking of the treaty, and this particular feature of it which we are now discussing as to sanctions, said:

> All the evidence goes to show that ratification will not mean the acceptance by the United States of the responsibility for solving the internal problems of Europe.

Professor Shotwell, one of our leading advocates of peace in this country and a prominent advocate of the league, in discussing this treaty, with reference to sanctions, said:

> But just what is involved in the treaty itself? More especially what are the commitments of the United States under it? Does our acceptance of it imply we are moving away from our policy of isolation? Does it tie us up with Europe and its post-war arrangements as some politicians have claimed? Or, on the other hand, does it achieve its main ideal while reserving for us all necessary freedom of action in other ways? For the answer to these questions one would naturally look into the text of the treaty itself. * * * The renunciation of war as an instrument of our own policy does not in itself call upon us to exercise any such suppression of others. Indeed, the present treaty takes pains to avoid just this commitment. * * * Renunciation, on the other hand, is a simple act by which every sovereign State declares for itself the condition of its own exercise of power.

Again, discussing a speech made by some celebrated Englishman, he said:

> It was not the Kellogg proposal which called upon His Majesty's Government "to cooperate in securing the peace of the world." This phrase carries us at once into the question of sanctions and the enforcement of peace and is completely out of the atmosphere of the Kellogg proposal.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in just a moment. The London Times in an editorial on May 19, 1928, said:

> Public opinion will be the only security against the violation of the peace, which public opinion has still to be built up.

And, finally, let us take the emphatic and clear statement of our Secretary of State, which reads as follows:

> The purpose of the United States is so far as possible to eliminate war as a factor in international relations. I can not state too emphatically that it will not become a party to any agreement which directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, is a military alliance. The United States can not obligate itself in advance to use its armed forces against any other nation of the world. It does not believe that the peace of the world or of Europe depends upon or can be assured by treaties of military alliance, the futility of which as guarantors of peace is repeatedly demonstrated in the pages of history.

This statement was made in a public address on the 15th of March, 1928, and was transmitted to all the powers signing the treaty and is now a part of the record making up and completing the negotiations leading up to the signing of the treaty. No one has been permitted to remain in doubt upon this question. Neither the language of the treaty nor the correspondence nor the public statements of public officials have been of such character as to permit two constructions to be placed upon the treaty in regard to the matter of sanctions. Punitive or coercive measures are neither provided for in the language of the treaty nor justified by any reasonable construction of the treaty. But in addition to this, our Government was open, frank, and unmistakable in the assertion of the utter absence of any intent to commit us to sanctions under the treaty.

I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. I want to ask the Senator just this question. How does he reconcile the emphasis which he placed on the second paragraph in the Kellogg pact, by which the signatories agree that they will resort for the solution of international troubles to nothing but pacific means, with the absolutely irreconcilable antagonism that he has always set up to our entering into the World Court, to say nothing of the League of Nations?

The Senator will recollect that by one of the reservations which we attached to our ratification of the World Court protocol the court was completely detached from all connection with the League of Nations.

Mr. BORAH. I do not recollect anything of that kind.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, that was the general construction placed upon the matter at the time.

Mr. BORAH. That was not the general contstruction in my opinion. At least there were many who did not take that view.

Mr. BRUCE. The most studious effort was made, so far as our country was concerned, to sever the World Court from the League of Nations by way of reservation. I am merely curious to know to what sort of tribunal the Senator from Idaho would have the countries of the world resort for the purpose of settling international controversies by pacific means, when he is so violently opposed to the entry of the United States into the World Court.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator concluded his question?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I have.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to enter into a discussion of the League of Nations or of the World Court. However, I will undertake, as briefly as I may, to satisfy the Senator's curiosity. If I may make a personal reference. I have always been an advocate of an international judicial tribunal.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, until he found that 52 of the civilized powers of the world agreed with him.

Mr. BORAH. No; but there was some doubt thrown upon it when I found the Senator from Maryland was for it.

Mr. BRUCE. I had not supposed that I had sufficient political significance for my views to influence the Senator one way or the other.

Mr. BORAH. Knowing the Senator's philosophy, that nothing counts in international affairs except sheer, brutal force, I naturally have a suspicion of anything that he advocates.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask the Senator not to say "sheer, brutal force." Nothing counts for anything in the field of international peace except that adequate police force which Mr. Taft had in contemplation when he became president of the League to Enforce Peace, and which Theodore Roosevelt had in mind when he said that international justice must be backed by an international police force. That is the kind of force I have in mind.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has in mind a sufficient force.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; a sufficient force applied as an instrument of international concert.

Mr. BORAH. Will not the Senator permit me to satisfy his curiosity by a full statement?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly. I am hardly in a position to refuse the Senator such an opportunity, as I am occupying the floor by his courtesy.

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator is not in a position to do so, but he succeeds in doing so. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRUCE. I hope that I may achieve success in some direction of a less doubtful character.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator has been a marvelous success in some directions.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to hear the Senator say so, but he is about the only person who has ever reached that conclusion.

Mr BORAH. Oh, no, the Senator from Maryland has a multitude of friends; although, of course, there were not quite enough. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think it will not be out of place, in view of the Senator's question, to go a little further into detail. As I said a moment ago, I have always been an advocate of an international judicial tribunal. The Senator has said that I was interested in that cause until I found that 52 nations had agreed upon a tribunal, and then I rebelled. I beg to say that is my objection to the World Court. I may have been in error, but I felt very sincerely that the World Court was called upon to exercise functions which ought not to belong to a judicial tribunal. It was, in my judgment, the legal adviser of the League of Nations. I did not object to it being the legal adviser of the League of Nations because it was the League of Nations, but because I regarded it as the legal adviser of a political institution, and I was opposed to it primarily for that reason. Any time that we can conceive a plan which

will erect an international judicial tribunal free from any political connection I do not know any reason in the world why I shall not be ready to support it.

Mr. President, I have only desired at this time to state what I understood to be the meaning of the pending treaty; what it is. I have no desire at present to discuss generally what I conceive to be the benefits to be derived from the treaty.

I will say, in conclusion, however, that some 60 nations have now either signed or adhered to the treaty. These nations represent practically the entire world. They have signed it upon the theory that it is an important step in the cause of peace. No one will contend, I presume, that it is the last and final step, but it is a step of almost incalculable moment. It is not all that we will have to do as the years go by in backing up the principle which is incorporated in the treaty. At the present time, however, we have all these nations adhering to or signing the treaty, accepting it as it is, and accepting it upon the theory that it will assist them in settling their controversies in a peaceful way. That can not be other than a most extraordinary achievement in the great cause in which we are all interested.

We have different views as to how to accomplish peace, as to how to advance it, but I take it that all of us are in favor of the ultimate objective, and, as all the nations have practically indorsed this treaty, I trust the Senate of the United States, without any unnecessary delay, will advise the world that it is satisfactory to the people of this country.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator said yesterday, if I understood him correctly, that the treaty forbids force under any circumstances.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I was using "force" in that connection in the sense of war. In my opinion the treaty does forbid war under any circumstances, except, of course, in case of self-defense. Except in that case, we all concede the treaty does not recognize the employment of war under any circumstances whatever.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator will realize that the word "force" has been used frequently, very loosely in the discussion of the treaty, and that, as it was stated yesterday and as the Senator agreed, under certain circumstances nonamicable measures short of war may involve the employment of force.

Mr. BORAH. I do not recall any circumstances except what would really come under the principle of self-defense.

If a government were defending its citizens or protecting the property of its citizens, in my judgment such action would come under the principle of self-defense or under another principle which is kindred to self-defense.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator think that the bombardment of Vera Cruz during the administration of Huerta was due to the necessity of our maintaining self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. I would not want to discuss that incident; it is in the past.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, we must learn of the future by what is in the past. I am curious to know whether the Senator thinks if this treaty were ratified it would be possible for us to send an expedition into Mexico under General Pershing, for instance, as we did at that time?

Mr. BORAH. I would not say as to any particular transaction; but let me say this—I will state what I conceive to be the principle of the treaty—that we would have a perfect right to send an expedition anywhere, whether into Mexico or China, if it were necessary, in order to protect the lives and property of our citizens against actual threatened attack. That is not an act of war. A nation has a right to give protection to its citizens and their property, and this is not, in international law, war. I assume that the acts of the government are confined to protection from threatened danger.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Our recollection of the fact must be clear that the expedition led by General Pershing went into Mexico in the fresh pursuit of an organized band of Mexicans who had invaded this country and had attacked an American town. It had nothing whatever to do with the occupation of Vera Cruz.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that is true, and I am not necessarily condemning the sending or approving the sending of these troops. It proved to be a futile act, but that was not necessarily a reason for not undertaking it. However, I would prefer to confine myself to what I conceive to be the general principles which will be applied to facts and circumstances as they may arise from time to time. In other words, when a question arises as to whether we are applying the principle of self-defense, the Senate of the United States will be the one to pass on it, and we will be perfectly safe!

Mr. BINGHAM. With the permission of the Senator I will refresh the memory of Senators as to what took place in Congress on April 22, 1914, by referring to the resolution, which reads:

> In view of the facts presented by the President of the United States in his address delivered to the Congress in joint session the 20th day of April, 1914, in regard to certain affronts, and indignities committed against the United States in Mexico: Be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the President is justified in the employment of the armed forces of the United States to enforce his demands for unequivocal amends for affronts and indignities committed against the United States; be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the United States disclaims any hostility to the Mexican people or any purpose to make war upon them.

In view of the statement in the second part of the resolution, does the Senator feel that the ratification of this treaty would in any way interfere with the Congress of the United States passing a similar resolution under similar circumstances in the future?

Mr. BORAH. If in the judgment of the Congress of the United States it should be necessary to do that in order to protect our interests, our citizens or their property, of course, it would have the right to take such action. I decline again to undertake to pass upon past transactions.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand—I do not want to misquote the Senator—that his view is that Mr. Chamberlain said and what other governments say in their notes at or prior to the time of the signing of this treaty does not affect the construction of the treaty. If he did not say that, then I misunderstood him. If he did say that, then how can it be claimed that anything that Mr. Kellogg may have said before the Foreign Relations Committee, although afterwards printed, would affect the treaty?

I may have misunderstood the Senator, and I want to understand him aright.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think the Senator has misunderstood me. But perhaps I did not make myself clear.

My contention is that the notes passing between the governments did not in any way change or effect a modification of the treaty. Now, understand again, lest I be misunderstood, that I do not contend that a treaty may not be modified or that notes may not have the effect of doing it; but what I contend is that the substance of these notes, the things that were said in the notes, are no different from that which is in the treaty without the notes. In other words, the notes deal with questions of self-defense. They do not enlarge or diminish or modify or curtail the right of self-defense as it would have existed under the treaty had the notes never been written.

Do I make myself clear?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Proceeding from that point, the Senator, I presume, also says that nothing that has been said by the Secretary of State conflicts with or enlarges in any way the true meaning of the treaties?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I know of nothing that the Secretary of State has said which does that.

Mr. REED. Then nothing that he has said is of importance, just the same as nothing that Chamberlain said and nothing that anybody else said is of importance, because, in the opinion of the Senator, they are all consistent with the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. In other words, if we had this treaty here, without a scintilla of writing, notes, or anything else, it would mean just exactly what it means when these notes come in.

Mr. REED. What does the Senator, then, say with reference to the position of Russia and the position of two or three other countries, which is that the form of the treaty was attempted to be changed by these previous notes, and they disclaim

the construction placed upon it? Does not the Senator think that as a matter of precaution we ought at least to have some regard to the opinions of the chancelleries of other countries?

Mr. BORAH. The Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Tchitcherin, stated what I have stated here—I think I have the language here somewhere—that while these notes had been written they signed the treaty, because, in their opinion, the notes had not in any way affected, modified, or changed the treaty.

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator will pardon me a minute while I get just what was said.

Mr. BORAH. In other words—of course, I can not quote his exact language—I think the Senator will agree with me that Tchitcherin took the position that the English note in no way changed the treaty.

Mr. REED. No; they took the position that they would not assent to the change, but they did not take the position that there was not any change.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think Russia would have signed this note if her representatives thought the English note had any effect?

Mr. REED. Let me read what was said. I have not it marked, however. If I can find a copy that is marked it will save time. I have the text here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I make a suggestion in that particular? My recollection of the substance of the Russian note is to the effect that the representatives of Russia were not in sympathy or in accord with the views expressed in the British note, but that they did not believe that the legal effect of the British note was to alter the treaty, and therefore they signed it, in no sense accepting the viewpoint expressed by the British in the Chamberlain note.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator from Arkansas has stated the matter accurately.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have not read it for some weeks, but that is my recollection.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think there is a different view here, if the Senator's patience will permit a further interruption.

Mr. JOHNSON. I just wanted to clear up, if I might, a point in reference to the construction that has just been suggested by the colloquy, if the Senator from Idaho will permit me.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON. The position of the Senator from Idaho is, as I understand it, that nothing is said in any note that the treaty does not inherently imply.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now let me put it the other way around. Let us assume that this treaty went to the World Court for construction, and let us assume that in the construction of the treaty by the World Court it held that there was no such implication in it as we have just agreed that there is: Would not the court, then, in construing the treaty, go to the English note to ascertain exactly what Great Britain signed?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and when they got there they would find exactly what is in the treaty—that is, the right of self-defense.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator did not follow me. I say, assuming that they did not hold, as we have been holding here, that the right of self-defense as described by the British was inherent in the treaty, then, in construing the treaty, the court would go to the condition annexed to it by Great Britain?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, if the court should hold that the right of self-defense was not inherent in the treaty, then they would go to the British note, and they would also go to Mr. Kellogg's note, for both of them have stated that the right of self-defense was reserved.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; the only query there recurring upon whether the right of self-defense was alike in each instance.

Mr. BORAH. But this treaty never can go to any court, because if it is violated we are the judges of that ourselves, and each signatory is the judge for itself.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; but there is one thing in that regard, and if the Senator will read the leading editorial in the New York Times today he will see that it is in the minds of those who are proposing this treaty that we are going further into some other place ultimately for some construction and for something further to be done.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not want to get into a debate here. I want to call attention to this document; but I should like to be permitted to say that it is a solecism to declare in a treaty that all questions are to be submitted to peaceful settlement—which necessarily implies, in many instances at least, some adjudicating body—and then in the same breath to say that there is no such tribunal and we are the sole judges. That will not do.

Mr. BORAH. No; I should not think it would do, and I do not know of anybody who has said it.

Mr. REED. I understood that to be the position that has just been taken.

Mr. BORAH. This treaty does not provide for any tribunal.

Mr. REED. No; but it implies a tribunal. It implies, if it means anything, that when two nations have a controversy, and they can not settle it or do not settle it by diplomatic means, other means must be found. Among the other means that we know of are arbitration or some tribunal or court; and therefore it is only a fair statement of this treaty to say that it means, "In case of a controversy we will not resort to force. We will endeavor to settle the matter between ourselves by peaceful negotiation; and if that fails we will not then go to war. We will adopt other means, and submit our case to some form of tribunal." So it does not mean that we are the sole judges, unless we are to take the position that after this treaty has been signed no nation is under any obligation to adopt any peaceful means whatsoever, but is at liberty simply to stand upon its position, and then defend that position by force of arms.

Mr. BORAH. I never stated that the subject of the controversy would not be a subject for a tribunal. What I say is that this treaty itself provides for no tribunal.

Mr. REED. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. BORAH. What we agree is that if a controversy arises, we will settle it by peaceful means.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; not quite. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is quite right—that we will not pursue any course except peaceful means.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is to say, if we seek the settlement of a controversy in any way, that method must be limited to peaceful means.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no obligation to settle, except perhaps as it may be implied: The obligation is to limit to pacific means such efforts as may be made for settlement.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. REED. Technically, that is correct. Of course it is true in every human controversy that if the injured and innocent party sees fit to rest under his wrong, he is under no obligation to go to a court about it. He is under no obligation to enforce his right. He can remain quiescent and suffer. But, dealing with this matter as a matter of practical common sense, we are trying to meet a condition where nations are not ready to submit to a wrong; and, therefore, being deprived by this treaty of the right to make war, they must find some other means; and the only means I know of, outside of peaceful negotiation—which is as old as civilization—is arbitration, a court, or something of that kind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, it has been said that it is up to every nation to determine what constitutes self-defense. Is it not true that every government that took part in the last World War did so under the right of self-defense?

Mr. BORAH. Under the claim of the right; yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Under the claim of the right of self-defense. Under that construction how could this treaty have stopped the World War?

Mr. BORAH. Is the Senator asking me that question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that this treaty could have stopped the World War. At one time I heard Lord Grey, who was at the head of the foreign affairs of England, say that if there had been some means which represented public opinion, which would have enabled him to call upon the governments to come into conference, in his opinion the World War could have been prevented. Do not understand that I am advocating this treaty upon the theory that it is the dawn of the millennium. I can easily understand that conditions might arise under which this treaty, like the Belgian treaty of neutrality, or other treaties, would go to ruin. I understand that perfectly. But this is a treaty under which, where ordinary controversies arise which might finally ripen into war, the signatories to the treaty would be enabled to ask a conference, a coming together of the nations, for the purpose of adjusting the controversy.

There are really no such things in these days as attack and defense in war, in the sense in which those terms grew up in the old days. War springs out of a multitude of things, different controversies arising which are not settled, engendering suspicion and distrust, and at last hatred and then war. This treaty is designed to afford a place where attention can be drawn to the fact that the nations have made a solemn pledge that they will settle their controversies. It is a method of bringing the nations together. It is not a guaranty against war. There is no such thing, I presume. But it is one of the vital, important steps in fostering a better relationship between nations when controversies arise. That is the object of the treaty, and in my opinion it has very great merit for that reason.

I can well understand that there are conditions under which the treaty would be utterly ignored.

The Senator from Missouri has said that this question of self-defense may be construed to a point where it becomes ridiculous and absurd, and so it may. I know of no means in the world by which we can control the discretion of a nation when it is exercising its right of self-defense.

The Closing Debate

JANUARY 15, 1929.

Speech of Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana.

MR. PRESIDENT, I rise to make some comment on criticisms which have been expressed touching the treaty under consideration. By way of introduction I take occasion to signify my dissent from the view which has been expressed within and without this Chamber, reluctantly by some who favor the treaty and exultantly by some who oppose it, that it is a mere gesture, a futile gesture, or a meaningless gesture.

To my mind it is vastly more than a gesture. It is in my estimation a revolutionary pronouncement reversing the position that war has hitherto occupied in the domain of international law. Heretofore war has been regarded in international law as a perfectly legitimate means by which a nation might advance its interests or its policies. Whatever might be thought of the nation that precipitated hostilities and however unprovoked might be its attack upon another country, it violated no law. It acted entirely within its sovereign right in doing so. It offended against no nation except the one assailed. If the treaty should be in force, it would be an outlaw in pursuing such a course. It would offend against every nation signatory to the treaty comprising, as it is expected, practically every civilized nation. It would become a lawbreaker and guilty of an international crime.

I do not overlook wars of self-defense, so called. They all contemplate an antecedent violation of the treaty by the nation against which the defensive measures are directed. At the worst, the treaty would cast upon a nation resorting to arms the burden of vindicating its course or losing the respect of the world.

The frantic efforts of the belligerents in the great World War to convince of the rectitude of their course and cause leave no room for doubt of the importance that is attached, and very rightly attached, to world opinion in such a crisis. The puny Republics of Bolivia and Paraguay are even at this moment employing the press in order each to justify its course not alone to free itself from the odium of being regarded as the aggressor but also in order to make more certain the sympathy of other nations from whom it might expect such aid as neutrals may extend.

Furthermore, there can be no doubt that a treaty such as this will act as a powerful deterrent upon any nation that might otherwise be bent on war. Treaties have been violated in the past, it is true; but whatever may be said concerning the fragile nature of treaties, no nation is entirely devoid of honor in some degree; no nation lightly violates its plighted word.

Much has been said in this debate and in connection with the discussion aroused by the cruiser legislation about the ruthlessness with which Germany disregarded her treaty with Belgium and about the incontinency of Italy in abandoning the cause of the Central Powers; but does anyone believe that either of those nations thus proved perfidious with a light heart and without misgivings? The task of inducing Italy to side with the Allies would have been a comparatively simple one if she had not already been bound by a solemn compact with their enemies. Those two instances of treaty violations, so recent and so gross, are believed by some to give support to the theory that treaties are entirely useless. Sight is lost of the innumerable treaties that have been scrupulously kept. It has never been seriously charged, I believe, that there has not been the most meticulous observance of the treaties entered into here in the city of Washington in 1922, limiting the number of capital ships of war that certain nations might maintain, and limiting the size of cruisers becoming units of their naval establishments. No one really doubts that if the late conference at Geneva upon the same subject had resulted in an agreement limiting the number of such cruisers it would have been religiously kept.

Two gentlemen enter into an agreement not to pursue a certain course of conduct, and, of course, there is less likelihood that they will pursue that course of conduct than if they had not so undertaken.

If the plighted word of individuals exercises a restraining influence over them, or incites them to action, why not that of a Nation?

It is not alone in the domain of international law that the treaty will effect a radical change. I believe it will exercise a powerful influence over the attitude of the people of the world with relation to war. Among savages every man is a warrior and is esteemed in proportion to his prowess and the success that he achieves. Every rude speech is a recital of the triumphs of the tribe and the valor of individuals. The necessary effect, if not the purpose, is to imbue every youth in the tribe with the hope that opportunity will come to him to join in some foray that he may emulate the example of his brave ancestors in battle. How much different is what has been fed to the generations as history? A succession of butcheries, the story of which always exalts the victors and sanctifies the unyielding victims. The tale is always a tale of the "pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war"; rarely, if ever, of the devastation wrought by conquering armies of the miseries endured by the combatants or the populace within the range of their operations, or the train of evils that invariably attended wholesale slaughter and that are visited upon the victors and the vanquished alike.

The successes are by the writers of the Nation achieving them magnified and emphasized and the reverses are minimized or entirely ignored.

I scanned with horror the huge canvases on the walls of the foreign office in Berlin, all depicting battles in which the German armies triumphed. Never a one was there of an engagement in which they suffered defeat. The situation in the Pantheon in Paris is not essentially different. Religion—at least what sometimes passes for religion—and poetry have combined to emphasize the glamor of war. Art has contributed not a little to the development of the war spirit. These considerations and many others have all operated to break down the resistance to the war spirit whenever provocation arises or the passions prompt to resort to war.

The treaty before us contemplates war as an essentially evil thing, and the nations signatory agree to abjure it because it is an evil thing. I regard this treaty as important, furthermore, because I look to see it followed by other agreements between the powers intended to attain or at least to promote, the end aimed at by it. If the nations of the earth agree to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and not to resort to it for the solution of international controversies, it seems to me necessarily to follow that they must set up some other kind of machinery for the solution of such controversies, at least as to those that are capable of solution by the application of legal principles, those that are justifiable in character. It would seem as though some arrangement of that kind is not only desirable but indispensable.

I said, Mr. President, that I rose for the purpose of submitting some observations upon criticisms of this treaty which have been heard within and without this Chamber. They are summarized in an address delivered by Professor Borchard, of Yale, at Williamstown during the summer, and therein appears to my mind practically everything that has been said against this treaty on this floor, of course, with more or less elaboration and repetition. I refer to it particularly because the instrument was introduced in the RECORD some time ago by one of the Senators holding views, I take it, quite in conformity with those expressed in the address, and because the name of the author came before the Senate yesterday in connection with remarks submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. It is understood likewise that the author inspired, if he did not dictate, the resolutions of "understandings" offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

For the purpose of illustrating the utter recklessness with which the writer uses the English language, I read first a sentence from the address as follows:

> When the United States at the first Hague conference secured recognition by our cosignatories for the Monroe doctrine, it was regarded as an achievement of American diplomacy.

It will be news to every Member of this Chamber, I am sure, that our representatives at the first Hague conference obtained recognition of the Monroe doctrine, and it would be startling intelligence, I am very sure, to most of the nations of the earth, some of which, as we were told by the Senator from Missouri the other day, have expressed themselves in contemptuous language concerning it.

What happened at the first Hague conference? The agreement setting up The Hague tribunal having been entered into the American plenipotentiaries attached the following to their signatures:

> Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

It was not in the body of the instrument at all; it was not above the signature of any other signer of the treaty; it was a mere declaration upon the part of the American representatives to that conference. I am not a little amazed that a teacher of international law should put out a statement to the world that the Monroe doctrine was recognized through the diplomacy of American representatives at the first Hague conference. I should be glad to hear from any gentleman who thinks that the Monroe doctrine was recognized by any nation by the action taken at the first Hague conference.

But to refer to the criticisms of the treaty by the writer. After having recited in brief the notes exchanged in relation to the treaty, the writer continues:

> The original proposition of Mr. Kellogg was an unconditional renunciation of war.

Then in italics:

> The treaty now qualified by the French and British reservations constitutes no renunciation or outlawry of war, but in fact and in law a solemn sanction—

A solemn sanction—

for all wars mentioned in the exceptions and qualifications.

The word "sanction" is there as inappropriately used as is the word "recognition" in the sentence to which I have heretofore adverted.

I find the Century Dictionary defining "sanction" as—

> the act of ordaining or decreeing as sacred or inviolable a decree, ordinance, sanction. The action of making sacred; the act of rendering authoritative as law; the act of decreeing or ratifying; the act of making binding, as by an oath.

I continue:

> When we look at the exceptions we observe that they include wars of self-defense, each party being free to make its own interpretation as to when self-defense is involved, wars under the league covenant, under the Locarno treaties, and under the French treaties of alliance.

I first call your attention to his complaint that under the treaty wars of self-defense are tolerated. Is there anyone here opposing the treaty who would like to include wars of self-defense in those which are interdicted? Would Mr. Borchard be in favor of a treaty which prohibited or interdicted wars of self-defense? If he is not, why advert to the matter? Why urge it as a matter of criticism of the treaty?

Even the Society for the Outlawry of War, whose views have been expressed upon this floor from time to time, in their program expressly exclude wars waged in self-defense.

We go on:

> Considering these reservations, it would be difficult to conceive of any wars that nations have fought within the past century, or are likely to fight in the future, that can not be accommodated under these exceptions. Far from constituting an outlawry of war, they constitute the most solemn sanction of specific wars that has ever been given to the world.

Now, observe:

> Considering these reservations, it would be difficult to conceive of any wars that nations have fought within the past century, or are likely to fight in the future, that can not be accommodated under these exceptions.

These exceptions are self-defense, Locarno, and the covenant of the League of Nations. No wars during the past century have been fought under either the Locarno agreements or the covenant of the League of Nations; so we reduce this statement to the fact that all wars which have been fought within the last century have been fought as wars of self-defense. Thus, the writer argues that the treaty is valueless, because it does not include wars of self-defense; and yet we are perfectly safe in saying that if it had declared against wars of self-defense it would have invited even more irrational criticism from the author of this article.

He goes on:

> Again it will be noticed that we recognize a British claim to use war as an instrument of national policy in certain undefined "regions of the world," any "interference" with which by anybody, including the United States, will be regarded by Great Britain as a cause of war.

Before I go to that, however, I want to advert to these so-called wars under the league covenant and the Locarno treaties.

When it was suggested in the correspondence between our Secretary of State and the French Government that perhaps the French Government would be unable to enter into a treaty of this character, because it was already bound to the Locarno treaties and the covenant of the League of Nations, Mr. Kellogg expressed the view that there would be nothing inconsistent at all in their doing so; in other words, that there was nothing whatever that was contradictory between those agreements and the covenant of the League of Nations. He elaborated this idea in his address, referred to in the notes, and said that if a nation should violate one of those agreements it likewise violates the multilateral treaty, and all other nations are released from their obligations under the multilateral treaty, and are at liberty to proceed against the offending nation as they see fit.

I read from Secretary Kellogg's note—

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator will observe that excepted, too, are what the French designate as their treaties of neutrality.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator state what those treaties of neutrality are?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Those treaties, as I understand the matter, are to the effect that if any of the nations with which France has these neutrality treaties shall be attacked by another nation, France will come to their aid; but if those nations are attacked by another one, that other one must violate this multilateral treaty, and that releases France to go to their aid.

I read:

I am reluctant to believe, however—

Mr. Kellogg says in his letter to Ambassador Claudel—

that the provisions of the covenant of the League of Nations really stand in the way of the cooperation of the United States and members of the League of Nations in a common effort to abolish the institution of war. Of no little interest in this connection is the recent adoption of a resolution by the Sixth International Conference of American States expressing in the name of the American Republics unqualified condemnation of war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations. It is significant to note that of the 21 states represented at the conference 17 are members of the League of Nations.

That is to say, 17 American Republics that are bound by the covenant of the League of Nations have asserted that they see no inconsistency whatever between that covenant and this treaty, and they freely sign this treaty.

But he goes on:

I trust, therefore, that neither France nor any other member of the League of Nations will finally decide that an unequivocal and unqualified renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy either violates the specific obligations imposed by the covenant or conflicts with the fundamental idea and purpose of the League of Nations.

That is to say, Mr. Kellogg said to them, "In my judgment there is no conflict at all between these things, and therefore it is unnecessary to make any exceptions with reference to that matter."

Let me be a little more specific about this matter.

Under the Locarno agreement Great Britain agrees to come to the aid of France if Germany should again invade her territory. Of course, if Germany should invade the territory of France she would be in violation of this multilateral treaty, and that would release all nations so far as Germany is concerned from their obligations, and they could proceed against her as they saw fit.

Germany, in her note, the first which came in response to the invitation to join in this treaty, said as follows:

Respect for the obligations arising from the covenant of the League of Nations and the Rhine pact must, in the opinion of the German Government, remain inviolable. The German Government is, however, convinced that these obligations contain nothing which could in any way conflict with the obligations provided for in the draft treaty of the United States. On the contrary, it believes that the binding obligation not to use war as an instrument of national policy could only serve to strengthen the fundamental idea of the covenant of the League of Nations and of the Rhine pact.

[*Senator Walsh here enumerated the same understandings as voiced by Japan, Ireland, Canada, Great Britain and Australia.*]

Mr. President, no nation has expressed any contrary view; and all of these have concurred in the view that there is nothing inconsistent in these instruments at all. Therefore the statement that there is reserved from this treaty wars waged under the Locarno agreement or the covenant of the League of Nations implies an entire misapprehension or is a misrepresentation of the whole situation. There is not any such reservation at all.

Let us go on. I read further from the article which I have used as a text:

But the most extraordinary feature of this treaty still remains to be mentioned. It will have been noticed that we recognize the legality of league wars and Locarno wars.

"We recognize the legality of league wars and Locarno wars." I dare say enough has been said upon that subject, but I want to add this: The covenant may be used as an excuse for perpetrating wrongs against another nation; it may be used as an excuse for a war of aggression, as may the Locarno treaty. It is absurd to say that we have approved in advance, or given any sanction whatever to any of these wars. All that has been said on our behalf is that a war legitimately waged under those agreements does not subject a nation joining in it to the charge of having violated this treaty, since the offending nation against which they proceed has by its acts released them from the multilateral treaty.

I continue:

As Europe correctly seems to assume—

Observe—

As Europe correctly seems to assume, we are now bound by league decisions as to "aggressors" and league policy generally, but without any opportunity to take part in the deliberations leading to league conclusions.

I submit that that statement borders upon the absurd. Let us suppose that the council of the league should determine, and determine erroneously, that some nation has been guilty of a violation of the covenant and a violation of this treaty, and they proceed to make war on it. How can it be said that we are bound in any sense whatever by any decision that is thus made? But even if they reach a just decision, in what sense is the United States "bound"? By what course of reasoning are we denied a right to reach a contrary conclusion, and what must we do or refrain from doing, whatever decision is thus arrived at?

To continue:

We indeed recognize by this treaty the legal right of the league to make war even against us.

I ask if absurdity can go any further?

Whether the further European claim that we are bound to *support* league conclusions as to "aggressor" nations, and other political conclusion, either by joining with the league or by refusing to trade with the league-declared pariah, is sustainable or not; at the very best it places us in the uncomfortable position either of being bound by decisions in the making of which we had no part or of having recriminations leveled against us for refusing to support our treaty.

The writer does not undertake to say that such a contention is even reasonably made, and yet it has been advanced in the course of this debate that when we agree that we will not go to war, we obligate ourselves to go to war against a nation which violates the treaty. Again:

We are now about to sign a treaty in which we expressly recognize the right of the other signatories to make war upon anybody, including ourselves, for the purpose of enforcing, even against us, their mutual obligations under the covenant of the League of Nations, not to mention individual undefined national interests in any part of the world. They alone will determine the occasion of such action, without our participation.

In justice to Europe, it can not be said they have left us in doubt as to their conception of our obligations. Indeed, these obligations are expressly or implicitly contained in the very reservations which the United States has excepted.

I have tried at least to make it clear that we have accepted no reservations of any kind. Those things that are called reservations are implicit in the treaty, necessarily implied.

Now, I want to advert to the much-commented-upon note of Mr. Chamberlain. I read paragraph 10 of his note of May 19:

The language of article 1, as to the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, renders it desirable that I should remind your excellency that there are certain regions of the world the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety.

"For our peace and safety."

His Majesty's Government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions can not be suffered. Their protection against attack is to the British Empire a measure of self-defense. It must be clearly understood that His Majesty's Government in Great Britain accept the new treaty upon the distinct understanding that it does not prejudice their freedom of action in this respect.

In the article to which I have just referred emphasis is given to the use of the word "interference" in this note, and much has been made of it in the course of the discussion here. It will be borne in mind that it must be read in connection with the sentence, which immediately follows:

His Majesty's Government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions can not be suffered. Their protection against attack is to the British Empire a measure of self-defense.

That is to say, if any nation should attack Egypt, for instance, Great Britain, the note says in effect, would be obliged to go to the defense of Egypt, regarding that as essential to the defense of her rights. They declare—and there is no reservation at all—that "In acting in self-defense we are obliged to protect these nations against attack from the outside." But that was scarcely necessary, because if Egypt, for instance, were attacked from the outside, the attacking nation would find itself in violation of this multilateral treaty, and all nations—Great Britain as well as every other nation—would be free to proceed against it at will.

Mr. President, let me suppose, now, that Great Britain has expanded beyond any legitimate extent her claim of the right of self-defense. What difference does it make to us? Why should we hesitate to sign a treaty because, forsooth, Great Britain is claiming more than in decency she ought to claim?

It has been practically suggested in this article to which I have so frequently referred that by this we sanction and approve any wars Great Britain may care to engage in. Let us illustrate. France has for centuries been in control of Martinique in the Caribbean Sea. If relations between Great Britain and France should become strained and there were really cause for apprehension that a war between them was imminent, and France should immediately proceed to construct and establish there a great naval base which might be used against Jamaica, for

instance, Great Britain might or might not be justified in regarding those acts upon the part of France as in the nature of a preparation for attack upon her, and possibly she would be justified, under the doctrine of self-defense, in taking steps to obliterate the works thus constructed by her ancient foe, now her ally.

Let us suppose on the other hand, however, that nothing of the kind exists; that these two nations that have thus enjoyed these two strategic points—France in Martinique and Great Britain in Jamaica—in a friendly way throughout the last century and a half at least continue their present relations and that there is no change whatever. If Great Britain would then seize Martinique, of course it would not be acting in self-defense, and who can assert that we have in advance given our approval or our sanction to any such aggressive conduct upon the part of Great Britain?

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yesterday placed us under obligations by giving us the particulars in which he thinks that, in the interest of the United States, this treaty should be clarified, as it is expressed. In the first place, it ought to be clarified, he said, to indicate that the right of self-defense is reserved. I would like to ask the Senator from Missouri, in perfect candor and good nature, I hope, whether he thinks that the right of self-defense would be prejudiced unless specifically reserved?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator is in error as to the position I took. I said that since the right of self-defense, it is specifically admitted by Mr. Kellogg, is reserved, I do not see that the treaty needs clarification in that respect.

Mr. WALSH. I took down the four points upon which the Senator said he felt the treaty ought to be clarified, as the Senator yesterday gave them to us, first, self-defense; second, Monroe doctrine; third, no obligation to apply sanctions; and, fourth, no recognition of the binding force of the treaties mentioned in the notes.

Mr. REED. I do not remember the exact statement, but whatever I said is in the RECORD. I was speaking of the matter in a general way, but I said, and it has been my position from the first, that since Mr. Kellogg made the statement that the right of self-defense was specifically reserved, and since England had accepted it, and France had accepted it, and every other nation, as far as I know, had accepted it, there is no doubt about that proposition.

Mr. WALSH. In the next place, the clarification ought to be made, it is clamored, so as to reserve to the United States the Monroe doctrine. That is the second point. Why should anything of the kind be done? There is no one here who has any hesitancy whatever in his support of the Monroe doctrine in its entirety. But why should we make a specific reservation of the Monroe doctrine when the right of self-defense is reserved as implicit in the treaty? Does anyone know of any justification for the Monroe doctrine except under the right of self-defense? Does anyone know of any ground that it may occupy within the field of self-defense? When we reserve self-defense, or when self-defense is reserved, we reserve all rights that we have ever asserted or claimed under the Monroe doctrine. The original language of this doctrine by President Monroe is so well remembered that I need not advert to it.

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator and I do not care to engage in debate about it. I hope we have about reached the point where we can get through this matter without further discussion. But since the Senator asks what is the use of reserving the Monroe doctrine, it has been admitted to be desirable to reserve the Monroe doctrine in many treaties.

I have in my hand the treaty of arbitration between the United States and the French Republic, from which I read:

The provisions of this treaty shall not be invoked in respect of any dispute the subject matter of which—

And then follow (a) and (b), and then—

(c) depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. WALSH. From what does the Senator read?

Mr. REED. I am reading from the arbitration treaty of 1928 between the United States and France. Similar treaties were negotiated during the year 1928 with Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Sweden, all containing similar language.

Mr. WALSH. All arbitration treaties?

Mr. REED. Yes. There are pending, we are advised by the State Department, negotiations for similar arbitration treaties with the following: Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Persia, Portugal, Rumania, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Siam, Spain, Switzerland, and Turkey. In all these treaties of arbitration we have upheld this doctrine. In The Hague tribunal we made reservations.

So I simply say it has been deemed advisable in the past to make express reservations. That being true, I think it would be wise to do it here. Of course, we can assert that this is the doctrine of self-defense. It has always been so stated, although we have sometimes extended it beyond what I think is strictly self-defense. I simply say that for the sake of clarity, and I do not care to discuss it. I hope I am through discussing this treaty.

Mr. WALSH. I am very glad the Senator has called attention to those treaties in which the Monroe doctrine has been reserved. Those are arbitration treaties. Those are treaties under which we agree to submit to arbitration certain questions. We do not agree in the pending treaty to submit anything to arbitration.

Mr. REED. I think we agree to submit everything to arbitration.

Mr. WALSH. No; we do not; and that is the difference between a "no war" treaty and an arbitration treaty. We agree that we will not go to war and that we will seek settlement by peaceful means.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that we could very well point out a difference, that in the treaties referred to by the Senator from Missouri unless the Monroe doctrine were excepted it would be included.

Mr. REED. Why, if it is a matter of self-defense?

Mr. NORRIS. Those who favor the treaty, and I think everybody practically agrees to it, maintain that the Monroe doctrine is already excluded.

Mr. REED. That is the point exactly. Everybody does not agree to it. It is a question whether the world would so construe it and hence, if everybody agreed to it here, why not say it? I think it is important to be said and I think we need not discuss it. But if the Monroe doctrine is a doctrine of self-defense, then these treaties of arbitration would exclude it as a part of the doctrine of self-defense. If we are not satisfied with that, we want it specifically mentioned. Of course, it is true no nation can ever waive its right of self-defense and retain its sovereignty, although the original language of these treaties was a waiver of every kind of defense. It was afterwards put in by implication, and it was stated that it was always there, but that we could not see it. The original intent of this treaty when it started off was undoubtedly to outlaw war.

Mr. WALSH. I cannot yield to the Senator to make his own speech. I want to take issue with his statement that the language was changed so as to include it.

Mr. REED. I did not say it was changed. I said the original intent was that, and afterwards the construction was given to the language.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator said that the language had been changed in order to exclude self-defense. There has been no change of the language at all.

It will be noted that not only the Monroe doctrine but some other questions are reserved from these arbitration treaties.

The provisions of this treaty—

According to article 3—

shall not be invoked in respect of any dispute the subject matter of which

(a) is within the domestic jurisdiction of either of the high contracting parties,

(b) involves the interests of third parties,

(c) depends upon or involves the maintenance of the traditional attitude

of the United States concerning American questions, commonly described as the Monroe doctrine,

(d) depends upon or involves the observance of the obligations of France in accordance with the covenant of the League of Nations.

Those questions we will not arbitrate, but that is an entirely different thing from the treaty before us. The first article of this treaty provides:

The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

That is to say, they agree not to go to war.

Article 2 provides:

The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

That does not say we will submit all our controversies to adjustment by pacific means, but it says that we will not seek the solution for them by any other than by pacific means; namely, we will not go to war about them. If we are going to specially exclude the Monroe doctrine from the operation of the treaty by reason of the considerations now advanced by the Senator from Missouri, we should exclude the other subjects mentioned in the arbitration treaties also. But they are not in here because we do not agree to submit them to arbitration.

Is it the contention of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] or the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that under this treaty we have to submit domestic questions to arbitration? Is that the understanding of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BAYARD. May I make this suggestion to the Senator—

Mr. WALSH. I would rather the Senator would answer my question first. Is it the opinion of the Senator that under the treaty before us we are obliged to submit to arbitration questions that are within the domestic jurisdiction of this country?

Mr. BAYARD. No; I do not think we are obliged to do it; but the point is—

Mr. WALSH. Is it the opinion of the Senator that we are obliged to submit to arbitration under this treaty a controversy that involves the interests of third parties?

Mr. BAYARD. No; I have not taken that position at all. The position I take is that, having that arbitration treaty, that treaty being in existence, if we adopt the present Kellogg peace pact then we revert to that arbitration treaty in good honor and fair honor as a means of conciliation between the two countries between whom the treaty of arbitration has been negotiated.

Mr. WALSH. I am trying to point out that there is a perfectly good reason for excluding the Monroe doctrine from a treaty by which all questions are submitted to arbitration except those specifically named and referred to in the treaty, while it is wholly unnecessary to do so in this treaty, which is not a treaty of arbitration at all, but simply a treaty of no war.

Mr. BAYARD. May I make this suggestion to the Senator? We still have in contemplation, according to the report sent me from the State Department, some 23 other nations with whom we will set up these arbitration treaties excluding the Monroe doctrine and other matters excluded in the French arbitration treaty from which the Senator just read.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; we will not arbitrate those questions.

Mr. BAYARD. But under section 2 of the present treaty now pending before the Senate we say:

The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

I suppose that "pacific means" must mean some channel of a friendly nation. We have established that channel or are trying to establish that channel, and when we establish that channel we set up certain conditions precedent.

Mr. WALSH. It simply means we will not endeavor to solve them by war; we will try to solve them in some other way.

Mr. BAYARD. But we decline to discuss those under these arbitration treaties.

Mr. WALSH. Discuss what?

Mr. BAYARD. The four reservations made in arbitration treaties. We say they are not subjects of arbitration.

Mr. WALSH. We would decline to discuss them here. We will not seek a solution of them by war. That is all we say.

Mr. BAYARD. Why can they not be expressed by some form of reservation here?

Mr. WALSH. There is no occasion to exclude them here, because we do not agree by this treaty to submit anything to arbitration.

Mr. SACKETT. There cannot be any breach of the Monroe doctrine, as I understand the Monroe doctrine to be expounded by every Senator upon the floor, without an attack of some kind.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly.

Mr. SACKETT. And if there should be an attack, then we would no longer be obligated under the treaty.

Mr. WALSH. We would be released.

Mr. SACKETT. And that is the reason why no mention of the Monroe doctrine is going to help this treaty one way or the other.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly. The Monroe doctrine presupposes an attack by some nation upon one of the American Republics, which necessarily releases the United States, and that, as well as the fact that the Monroe doctrine is based upon self-defense, safeguards it completely, in my estimation.

[Senator Walsh here presented an historical review of the development of the Monroe doctrine.]

I think the world understands that the Monroe doctrine is a part of our system of self-defense. I do not think there can be any question about that; at least we so understand it.

The next reason why this treaty should be clarified, according to the Senator from Missouri, is to get rid of anyone imagining that there is an obligation to apply sanctions; that is to say, we should provide by declaration of this body that when we agree not to go to war we do not mean that we will go to war. The contention that by this treaty we obligate ourselves to go to war against every nation violating it originates in a disordered mind. I care not who may have said in Europe that there is an implied obligation on the part of every nation to assail that nation which violates the treaty, I insist that it goes against common sense. Greece invades Bulgaria in violation of the treaty. Of course we would deplore anything of the kind, but under what kind of reasoning can it be argued that we have obligated ourselves by this treaty to go to the aid of Bulgaria? It would not clarify this treaty to say we were under no such obligation. It would introduce confusion worse confounded.

Then we ought to have some clarification, it is advanced, so that it will be understood that there is no recognition of the binding force of the treaties named in the notes. The treaties named in the notes are the covenant of the League of Nations, the Locarno treaties, and the neutrality treaties. Why should we undertake to say that there is or there is not any binding force in the covenant of the League of Nations among those who entered into it? Why should we undertake to say that France's neutrality treaty with Poland and France's neutrality treaty with Czechoslovakia are binding or are not binding upon either Czechoslovakia or Poland? I do not think the Senator from Missouri could possibly have made that suggestion reflectingly.

The treaty needs no clarification. It is in no sense ambiguous. The notion that peril to our Nation lurks in it is "wrought of such stuff as dreams are and as baseless as the fantastic visions of the morning."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, your Committee on Foreign Relations has unanimously agreed upon a report which will be drafted and ready for final action in a few moments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has just taken place I want to say a word. I should like to express my sincere views in a very brief way as to what I think of the treaty.

When we come to analyze this treaty, and to consider what the treaty is and what is behind it, and compare it with what is in other treaties for peace and what is behind other treaties,

why should this treaty be considered as impractical or as an ideal beyond the power of men and women to attain? Why should a treaty renouncing war and pledging nations to the settlement of their controversies through pacific means be regarded as without value? Is the obligation in this treaty any less binding than the obligation in any other treaty? Is the honor or the good faith of the nations signatory to this treaty any less binding than the honor and the good faith of the nations signatory to any other treaty? If I understand international affairs, there is nothing behind any treaty save the honor and the good faith of the nations signing the treaty. They all rest upon the honor and the faith of the nations, and nothing more.

Sir Austen Chamberlain said at Geneva a few months ago, at a time when he was discussing a treaty which provided for the use of force, "Do what we will, we must depend at last upon the plighted word."

We may talk about treaties providing for war, and providing for the use of armies and navies, and for economic boycotts, but there is at last nothing behind any of those treaties except the honor and the good faith of the nations signing them.

There is just the same honor, the same binding obligation, and the same good faith behind an agreement not to go to war under any circumstances that there is behind an agreement to go to war under certain circumstances. Let us take an illustration. Suppose we have a treaty which provides for an economic boycott, and suppose the conditions upon which the boycott is to be laid have arisen, and suppose the time has come when we are to lay the economic boycott, and the nations refuse to go along. What is to be done about it? How is the treaty to be enforced? There is nothing behind it except that which is behind this treaty; that is, the honor of the nations signing the treaty.

Suppose there is a treaty providing for the use of an army or a navy, for the use of force, for the purpose of punishing another nation, and the time comes when those parties to the treaty are to punish the other nation, but the nations having signed refuse to go along, do not deem it to their welfare to go along. What is to be done about it? There is nothing, in the last analysis, except what there is behind this treaty; that is, the honor and good faith of the nations signing the treaty.

It has been intimated that it is easier to mobilize the passions for war, and is easier to direct the passions for conflict, than it is to mobolize the passions for peace or the passions for adjustment. I challenge the proposition. I say that the most searching, universal, and profound passion in the human breast to-day is the passion for peace, and if it is organized and directed as we organize and direct the passion for war, it will dominate and control in international affairs, and the great object and purpose of this treaty is to organize the peace forces, to organize the moral influences, in behalf of adjustment of difficulties without conflict. Its great purpose is to let the peace machinery of all peace plans work—to utilize the everlasting real aspiration of the human family.

Mr. President, it is said there is no security in this treaty, that there is no safety in it, that people are signing with their tongues in their cheeks. For decades and decades nations and people have been presistently and pathetically pleading for security, for safety, for some kind of understanding which would give them security; and they are entitled to it. Particularly has that been the problem since the World War. Fear and distrust and suspicion and hatred have tortured and tormented the human family long enough. They are entitled to the security for which they plead. But how are they to get security? How are they to get protection?

I do not hesitate to say that a scheme which undertakes to build security upon international force is a mad delusion. Any such scheme carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Nothing could better illustrate this than the happenings of a few months ago at the Geneva assembly. The premier of the British Government, speaking on behalf of his Government, declared that the British Government could not and would not undertake to go further in extending that kind of security to foreign governments, that it would not undertake to go further in furnishing an army or a navy or giving the protection of its strong and mighty arm, and in effect he declared that to do so would imperil the existence of the British Empire itself.

To those who believe that security can be based upon international force I say, here is the fatal weakness. No responsible government will undertake to give an unlimited promise for the use of its fortunes and its people, no responsible government will undertake to pledge its army and its navy to another power, except upon the theory that it is necessary to its own immediate protection and defense.

When we pass outside of a certain range, a certain territory, or a certain latitude, no government will undertake to pledge security beyond that limitation. The result is that when we are building security upon force, we break the world up into groups and alliances and balances of power which in themselves breed distrust and suspicion, and, at last, hatred and war. This scheme brings into existence the very conditions which inevitably breed war.

Mr. President, that has been the history of Europe for these thousand years, and what is happening in Europe today? They are seeking security, based upon international force, by building up new groups and new alliances and new balances of power, and a whole continent is again being saturated with suspicion and distrust.

It is one thing to pledge the nations of the earth to peaceable adjustment, but it is a wholly different thing to pledge the lives and the fortunes of the people of a nation on the other side of the world.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, does not the Senator know—I assume that he has forgotten, however—that this Nation right now, without limitation, has made that very pledge to Japan, to maintain its territorial integrity and to enforce its rights in the Pacific? I refer to the 4-power pact.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I remind the Senator from Virginia also of the Locarno-Rhine pact, in which England has pledged her entire power to guarantee France and Germany from invasion?

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; a fine illustration, a beautiful illustration. Great Britain was perfectly willing to pledge security against the western frontier and upon the western problems, but when they undertook to extend it to a controversy upon the eastern side, Great Britain in effect said, No, that is beyond what we think is necessary to our protection and our security. We will not extend our guarantee beyond our own immediate interests. That is a beautiful illustration. That is a complete example that such a scheme breaks the world up into groups and groups deluge the world with distrust and finally engender war.

Mr. GLASS. But the Senator knows that England is in honor bound to maintain the territorial integrity of all Japanese possessions in the Pacific Ocean and to enforce its rights, and so is the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely, Mr. President. England is bound because her possessions and her interests in China are equal to those of Japan. She is simply entering into a combination for the purpose, I say again, of protecting her interests. But these nations will not go beyond what they conceive to be the immediate protection of their own interests. The last 10 years proves that beyond peradventure. As to the United States, it has not guaranteed any territory for Japan.

Mr. BRUCE. Have not Great Britain and Italy guaranteed Germany against invasion and France against invasion, the two powers in the world that are most likely to come into conflict?

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; and because they have limited it to a controversy that may arise upon the western side of Germany or the western frontier. Great Britain refused to incorporate the eastern frontier in her pledge.

Mr. GLASS. I am not talking about Great Britain.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Maryland was.

Mr. GLASS. I am talking about this Government of ours. I say that under the 4-power pact the United States has pledged its honor, its army, its navies, and every power that it may exert

to guarantee the territorial integrity and to maintain the rights of Japan in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. GLASS. No; I am not. I have the treaty right here now.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator the reservation? The reservation says that this treaty does not bind us to use force or commit us to the use of force in the carrying out of the 4-power pact.

Mr. GLASS. I do not note any reservation whatsoever. There may be a reservation, but it is a reservation somewhat like the Senator's report from the Foreign Relations Committee, that will have no application to the treaty itself. Here is the plain text of the treaty, and I will read it to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly familiar with it.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator seems to have forgotten it.

Mr. BORAH. No; I have not forgotten it at all. If the Senator will read the reservation, he will find it is exactly in accord with what I have stated.

Mr. GLASS. I do not discover any reservation here. My recollection is there was no reservation.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; there was a reservation. The Senator has overlooked it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was the reservation in the form of an interpretative note?

Mr. BORAH. No; it was adopted here by the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As a resolution of the Senate?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; as a resolution of the Senate.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that we close debate and vote. I feel that by reason of an understanding I must not go further with this debate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator that the hour of 4 o'clock was suggested in his unanimous-consent request, but it is now 4:05, so he had better make it 4:10. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I now file the report of the committee. I ask to have read the first article in the treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I want to say that I have seen the substance of what will be presented in the report. I presume it will be read, of course, to the Senate. So far as I am concerned I am content with the suggestion made by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may vote at not later than 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so agreed. The clerk will read the report.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following report:

"Your Committee on Foreign Relations reports favorably the treaty signed at Paris, August 27, 1928, popularly called the multilateral or Kellogg-Briand treaty. The two articles in this treaty are as follows:

" 'ARTICLE I. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

" 'ART. II. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.'

"The treaty in brief pledges the nations bound by the same not to resort to war in the settlement of their international controversies save in bona fide self-defense and never to seek settlement of such controversies except through pacific means. It is hoped and believed that the treaty will serve to bring about a sincere effort upon the part of the nations to put aside war and to employ peaceful methods in their dealing with each other.

"The committee reports the above treaty with the understanding that the right of self-defense is in no way curtailed or impaired by the terms or conditions of the treaty. Each nation is free at all times and regardless of the treaty provisions to defend itself, and is the sole judge of what constitutes the right of self-defense and the necessity and extent of the same

"The United States regards the Monroe doctrine as a part of its national security and defense. Under the right of self-defense allowed by the treaty must necessarily be included the right to maintain the Monroe doctrine which is a part of our system of national defense. Bearing upon this question and as to the true interpretation of the Monroe doctrine as it has always been maintained and interpreted by the United States, we incorporate the following:

" 'We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. * * * It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness.' (President Monroe's message, December 2, 1823.)

" 'The doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a Nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinct form of government.' (Message of President Cleveland, December 17, 1895.)

" 'The doctrine is not international law, but it rests upon the right of self-protection and that right is recognized by international law. The right is a necessary corollary of independent sovereignty. It is well understood that the exercise of the right of self-protection may, and frequently does, extend in its effect beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of the State exercising it. * * * Since the Monroe doctrine is a declaration based upon this Nation's right of self-protection it can not be transmuted into a joint or common declaration by American States, or any number of them.

" 'It is to be observed that in reference to the South American governments, as in all other respects, the international right upon which the declaration expressly rests is not sentiment or sympathy or a claim to dictate what kind of government any other country shall have, but the safety of the United States. It is because the new governments can not be overthrown by the allied powers "without endangering our peace and happiness;" that "the United States can not behold such interposition in any form with indifference." ' (Hon. Elihu Root, July, 1914.)

" 'There are now three fundamental principles which characterize the policy of President Monroe as it was and as it is. First, the Monroe doctrine was a statement of policy originated and maintained by reason of self-interest, not of altruism. Second, it was justifiable by reason of the right of self-defense (which is a recognized principle of international law). Third, it called no new rights into being; therefore, whenever it oversteps the principle of self-defense, reasonably interpreted, the right disappears and the policy is questionable, because it then violates the rights of others. * * * The Monroe doctrine is based upon the right of self-defense. This is the first law of nations, as of individuals.' (Prof. Theodore Woolsey, June, 1914.)

"The committee further understands that the treaty does not provide sanctions, express or implied. Should any signatory to the treaty of any nation adhering to the treaty violate the terms of the same, there is no obligation of commitment, express or implied, upon the part of any of the other signers of the treaty to engage in punitive or coercive measures as against the nation violating the treaty. The effect of the violation of the treaty is to relieve the other signers of the treaty from any obligation under it with the nation thus violating the same.

"In other words, the treaty does not, either expressly or impliedly, contemplate the use of force or coercive measures for its enforcement as against any nation violating it. It is a voluntary pledge upon the part of each nation that it will not have recourse to war except in self-defense, and that it will not seek settlement of its international controversies except through pacific means. And if a nation sees proper to disregard the treaty and violate the same, the effect of such action is to take it from under the benefits of the treaty and to relieve the other nations from any treaty relationship with the said power.

"This treaty in no respect changes or qualifies our present position or relation to any pact or treaty existing between other nations or governments.

"This report is made solely for the purpose of putting upon record what your committee understands to be the true interpretation of the treaty, and not in any sense for the purpose or with the design of modifying or changing the treaty in any way or effectuating a reservation or reservations to the same."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask that we now proceed with the consideration of the first article of the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], while he is on his feet, now that all elements have reconciled their differences and everybody is for the treaty, has the State Department any objection to the report of the committee being adopted? I judge from what the Senator from Idaho said in his speech the other day that the State Department had no objection to the filing of the report, but would object to its adoption.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am proceeding on my own responsibility.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator from Idaho does not know how the State Department feels about it?

Mr. BORAH. I repeat, I am proceeding on my own responsibility.

Mr. HARRISON. I find myself trying to follow the Senator from Idaho and the State Department, but with one going one way and the other going the other way, I am lost.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Mississippi will follow me, he will be all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. I shall do that.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution of ratification.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 85, the nays are 1. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution is agreed to and the treaty is ratified.

NEWS *of the* CHRISTIAN WORLD

A DEPARTMENT OF INTERDENOMINATIONAL ACQUAINTANCE

Chief Justice Flays American Materialism

In a recent interview Chief Justice Taft was asked, "What do you consider the most disturbing element in our national life?" His reply was to the point: "It is difficult to describe precisely, but it may be understood when I characterize it as the materialistic philosophy which places wealth and worldly success ahead of every other consideration in life. What can it profit a man to have accumulated millions if he has not at the same time maintained a clear conscience and acquired the good will and esteem of his fellow citizens?"

William Allen White to Address California Pastors

William Allen White, of Emporia, Kan., is scheduled to deliver the annual Earl lectures in connection with the pastoral conference to be held at Berkeley, Cal., Feb. 19-21, in the auditorium of Wheeler hall on the university campus. His subject will have to do with the social movements of the present day in the light of Christian ethics.

Shanghai Has Church of 5,000 Members

There has recently been dedicated in Shanghai, China, a church building costing $120,000 which will house a congregation of 5,000 members. This is the Fitch Memorial church, which has been erected by the Presbyterian board of foreign missions, to honor the memory of Dr. and Mrs. George F. Fitch, who served as missionaries in central China more than a half-century.

Dr. T. R. Glover Accepts Chair In Yale Divinity School

Dr. T. Reaveley Glover, for several years professor of New Testament at Cambridge, and who is now visiting professor of New Testament in Yale divinity school, has been induced to accept the chair of New Testament at Yale, succeeding Prof. Benjamin W. Bacon, who retired last year. Dr. Glover is best known in this country as the author of "The Jesus of History," "Paul of Tarsus" and other books on religion.

Community Church, New York, Gives Reception for Edwin Markham

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Markham were given a reception in mid-January by the Community church, New York, of which Dr. John Haynes Holmes is minister. During the evening Mr. Markham declaimed his famous poems, "Lincoln" and "The Man With the Hoe." The latter poem has been translated into 50 languages, reports Dr. Sydney Strong, who tells "Unity" readers about the reception.

Dr. E. T. Devine Retires from American University Post

Dr. Edward T. Devine, dean of the graduate school and professor of social economy at American university, Washington, D. C., who raised his voice in protest at the political activity of the evangelical clergy during the recent political campaign, has resigned his post to accept a position in the public health work of the city of New York Feb. 1. The official announcement of Dr. Devine's departure took no cognizance of the recent controversy. Dr. Devine had been with American university for two years and a half, coming from New York, where he had lived for several years. The position

British Table Talk

London, January 9.

THE news of the king continues to give hope that, though his recovery may be very slow, it is not now beyond a reasonable hope. He has shown a will-to-live which helps the doctors at this point in the story more than anything else. One precedent, it may be taken for granted, has been established by this illness: doctors in the future will take the public into their confidence, more than they used to do, when the great fall ill. The king's physicians have been wise in their frankness, and we do not think it necessary to regard their bulletins as "half-revealing and half-concealing." In future we shall certainly expect the same frankness as we have received from Sir Stanley Hewett and Lord Dawson of Penn.

Hope for the King's Recovery

* * *

England's Glory In Cricket

It is probably vain to explain to a nation of baseball players what an Englishman feels about cricket. But my readers will understand that there was some enthusiasm last week when England beat Australia for the third time. There has been too much hysteria about the business, as I have said before; but for the players themselves there is nothing but admiration from all of us. Chapman, the captain, and his men have played like great cricketers; their team has held together without jealousy, and without littleness. We have had to submit to many humiliations in recent years; we have been told that our cricketing glory has departed. But it hasn't.

* * *

Dr. Jacks on Education

It is the season of conferences, especially of such as teach. Schoolmasters take their holidays seriously, at least in January. They think together upon their problems. Dr. L. P. Jacks, to take one illustration, has discoursed with his almost infallible wisdom upon "Education for Skill." The best methods of training the mind are indirect methods, he said, the training of the body being an indirect way of training the mind. Bodies possessed of no skill are frustrated bodies; some belong to rich fools, some to graduates, others to criminals, hooligans and wasters. These bodies are the greatest evil in the modern world. "The finest sort of fellowship among human beings," he added, "is that which arises from co-operation in skilful work. The massing together of large numbers of people with no skill and with money in their pockets is a great social danger. The disaster of the unskilful man lies in the way he uses his leisure. He has to buy his pleasures ready-made, and they are usually very poor. Education for leisure is one of the greatest tasks of the future. Think of the vast sums of money made out of silly pleasures devised for people who are mere bundles of tired and shattered nerves. Think how the sex side of life is being exploited by clever people who know the weak spots in human nature and are determined to make money out of their knowledge."

* * *

An Authority on Public Health

At another conference Sir George Newman said that we lose much by not providing medical treatment for young persons between 14 and 16. When boys or girls leave school between those years, they steadily deteriorate in health. Unless they join the Boy Scouts or Girl Guides, they have little help in guidance. This is a warning which will not go unheeded. Sir George Newman is our chief authority on public health and no one can estimate the debt that this country owes to him.

* * *

And So Forth

Among the centenaries which will be celebrated this year are several of special interest in the story of the Christian church. General Booth, Archbishop Benson, Canon Liddon, Dr. R. W. Dale were all born in 1829. . . . At the present moment at Sunbury the high council of the Salvation army is met, but behind closed doors. More later! . . . A wonderful exhibition of Dutch masters is open at the Royal Academy. The pictures have been chosen and hung by a joint Anglo-Dutch committee. Rembrandt has over 50 pictures. Among others which I long to see are those pictures of Dutch interiors by Van de Hoogh and others. . . . Henry Arthur Jones is dead. He was a skilful dramatist of the old school, who knew their theater and could write excellent plays, but did not delve too deeply into the working of the soul of man. . . . Mr. Philip Guedalla has been denying the promise of our younger novelists. I picked up the other day the latest work of Mr. Aldous Huxley and I confess that even one who is familiar with the liberty claimed by modern novelists, would put this book outside the bounds of legitimate literary art. . . . There seems no reason why the election should not be in May or June. It is hoped by the supporters of the government that Mr. Churchill will be able to grant some remission to the taxpayer. To put the date farther off would be to dislocate business.

EDWARD SHILLITO.

to which he goes carries a considerable salary increase over that of his present post, it is reported.

Dr. Straton Denies That He Claimed Infallibility

In a letter from Dr. John Roach Straton, of Calvary Baptist church, New York city, reference is made to a recent quotation in this paper from McClure's

Foreign Missions Conference in Hesitant Session

Detroit, January 19.

ACCOMMODATIONS "without discrimination of race" attracted the Foreign Missions Conference of North America to the Hotel Statler, Detroit, January 14 to 18. That indicates one of the noticeable trends in mission board thought today. "Trends" seemed to be the theme of the conference. No effort was made to review the achievement of the past year. No attempt was made to outline programs and policies for the future. Attention was directed to discovering and defining the trends of life in national and international developments, in the progress of the church, in mission administration, in attitudes and relationships. The most evident trend observed was that toward social consciousness in the missionary enterprise. The day of reckoning success in terms of "number of souls saved" is well passed. Instead the questions are asked, "Are lives changed? What industrial conditions have been improved? Have missionary candidates any trace of racial prejudice? Do missions make for an improved economic life for the farmer?"

Changing Tests of Mission Success

* * *

Changing Attitudes toward Other Faiths

Closely related to this is the trend in attitudes toward other faiths. This is no longer one of antagonism. Perhaps the conference would have had difficulty in defining its attitude after listening to two such divergent interpretations of the Jerusalem "message" as were presented by Dr. Robert E. Speer and President Edmund D. Soper. It is one of the marvels of that message—one may say of Christianity itself—that it is broad enough and dynamic enough to hold together as its champions men of radically different points of view in their interpretation, application and emphasis of the heart of the gospel.

* * *

Scientific Research Demanded

A relatively new trend was detected in the demand and provision for scientific research. At times emotion and prejudice have been strong factors in assigning causes and determining methods and policies to be pursued. This is no longer to be the case with the administration of foreign missions. Mr. Charles H. Fahs presented charts and figures that showed plainly the trends in financial contributions from the churches. It appeared evident that the overseas work was being sacrificed to what some regard as an extravagant tendency in American church building projects. But the conference wisely jumped to no hasty conclusions; instead it asked for careful investigation into causes. In this connection reference should be made to the only lively parliamentary debate of the entire session. It came over the proposal to house the Missionary Research library at Union Theological seminary. Many delegates had heard the matter discussed so often before that they were ready for immediate action. Others urged further deliberation and investigation of possible alternatives. One was reminded of the United States senate when an ecclesiastical administrator "over seven states" of the west discussed oil lands and wildcat investments in his effort to defer for ten weeks more a decision to move a research library into adequate, safe, permanent quarters. The vote was 2 to 1 in favor of accepting the seminary's offer. The winning argument was improved facilities and release of funds for scientific missionary research.

* * *

The New-Style Mission Speaker and Speech

It takes no stretch of imagination to detect a trend toward unconventionalism in the type of speakers who were invited to fill gaps in the program. Dr. Halford Luccock of Yale divinity school and Mr. Stanley High, editor of the Christian Herald, were called in as pinch hitters. They, with Mr. Y. C. James Yen of Peking, brought in the winning runs. What was regarded by some as "the most significant statement of the conference" was made by Rev. Bhaskarao Hivale of Harvard when he contrasted British democracy with the condescension of American missions and appealed for *comradeship* on the mission field. The one emotional thrill of the meeting was provided by the simple testimony of Miss Lucy Wang, president-elect of Hwanan Women's College, China. She found in the change of her condition from an unwanted baby girl in a conservative home to this participation in "the Christian fellowship of east and west" a testimony to the changing power of Jesus Christ. A more adequate recognition of the leading place women are having in the redemption of the world was noticed. The business committee of the conference was presided over by Miss Sarah S. Lyon of the Young Women's Christian association. The election of officers for the coming year brought Miss Helen B. Calder, of the American board, into the chair, and she presided over several sessions with dignity, grace and ability. The Federation of Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions held meetings before and after the general program.

* * *

Losing Causes At Sea

There were times during the conference when observers felt that little was being done. There was plenty of talk—too much speech-making—but little action. Part of this was due to the very marked tendency to transfer field administration from the board offices to the countries concerned. The transitional process does not make for rapid progress and efficiency. There is grave danger that important action will be "lost at sea" in repeated transfers back and forth. A tragic illustration of this is seen in the critical problem of producing and distributing Christian literature, especially in China. For years this shuttlecock has been batted back and forth. The Commission on Policies and Methods in China which met in Hartford last June with a large and able representation referred to this need as "urgent at this critical hour" and Prof. Latourette selected this as one of two items in the commission's report for special emphasis. But apparently both the conference and the several mission boards consider this as a field problem—as it is—and nothing gets done.

* * *

Overloaded with Functionaries

There are advantages in not trying to do much in a heterogeneous gathering of over three hundred people. It avoids the appearance of being reactionary. It is fair to say that in the main mission board secretaries are more aggressive and farsighted than are the boards which they represent. They can move forward faster when four or five of them get together in their offices than when they have to drag along their official bodies. At that they are in no danger of becoming radical. Yet the Foreign Missions conference would probably be a more valuable gathering if it could surrender its recently acquired publicity and educational functions, eliminate a hundred or two bishops, pastors and official observers, and resolve itself into discussion groups of board administrators with perhaps selected, authoritative foreign field representation. The one attempt to provide for group discussion at Detroit was accepted by a large proportion of these administrators as an opportunity to look after other business.

* * *

Non-Productive Discussion

These discussion groups dealt with religious education, racial relations, industrial conditions and rural needs. Religious education calls for religion in all education and the educational attitude in all religious work. The discussion was depressingly general and non-productive of results. A spark was struck in dealing with race problems when the American and Canadian immigration laws were attacked and the mission boards were asked to give consideration to cases of discrimination against East Indians. The industrial conditions in South Africa aroused vigorous protest from several speakers. The constructive program outlined for rural community work, led by Dr. Butterfield, Dean Reisner and Dr. Jesse Jones, reached something of an anticlimax in the call to the churches everywhere to observe another special Sunday in which prayers are to be offered for crops and their producers. Some hasty thought was given to

(*Continued on page* 181)

Magazine, in which Dr. Straton was represented as telling Mr. Charles Driscoll, in an interview, that he was "infallible in matters of faith and morals." The quotation was correct, bur Dr. Straton states that Mr. Driscoll's reported interview, while kind in its general trend, did him injustice in several statements. Dr. Straton says he claimed infallibility "as any born-again child of God would be infallible if he were perfectly grounded in righteousness." Also, that he claimed to be a prophet, but "as every real preacher who is led of God, is a prophet." The Driscoll interview, Dr. Straton states, was not

Students of Britain Think Together at Liverpool

London, January 7.

I RETURNED today from Liverpool where the quadrennial conference of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain has just disbanded. It was a conference of much importance, about which American readers should be informed. First of all the pictures recorded on the walls of memory must be not the speakers but the hearers. It is seldom granted to us to see a company of 2,000 of whom the greater number have not yet come of age, and almost all have their life to offer. They are there for one conference only; in 1933 there will be another relay. These hearers are assembled in the cathedral in the gray light of a January morning. The cathedral, too, is young with all the glory of the morning resting upon it—itself a witness that the days of defiant and exultant faith are not ended. Morning by morning we met there for worship. One day an Indian leader of the movement, Mr. S. K. Datta, guided our thoughts, leading us to think of the majesty of the Most High. There we heard the Lord of the World answer Job out of the whirlwind, and there, too, followed the pilgrim down to the river and listened to his cry, "Welcome Life!" If we were in danger of forgetting the holiness and mystery of the Lord with whom we had to do, those morning hours saved us.

* * *

The Purpose and The Glory

There were two main lines of thought running through the program and meeting at the end in the spirit of the listeners: "The purpose of God," and "The glory of friendship." In the morning speaker after speaker talked of that purpose which meets us, and holds us, and calls us in Christ Jesus. It was seen against the background of the long preparations in nature, groaning and travailing in pain, wating for the revelation of the sons of God. It was seen incarnate in Christ. The prologue was written in eternity; but the word could only be spoken in a human life, and in Bethlehem, the last inhabited village on the frontier of redeemed human territory in Bethlehem, the house of bread, on the edge of an inhospitable waste, the word became ours. The manner of that revelation was interpreted from the hour when Jesus made his choice among the ways open to him to the hour when into the world came the community of the loyal, finding their bond of fellowship in him, the crucified and risen. To that revelation, to that word spoken; to that gift of the new life, we had to adjust ourselves. That was to be our repentance—readjustment to this reality altogether lovely and worthy of our trust.

* * *

The Way of Friendship

Evening by evening the way of friendship was followed. To be a friend is an experience which we know in youth, as well as we shall ever know it. The students assembled in Liverpool—nearly forty nations had sent representatives, so that it was an international assembly,—were different in race and in their lines of study, but they shared one common experience. Could that be a starting-point from which they could move Godward, and manward? Clearly the spirit of friendship was needed by all mankind. So said my friend, John Whale, a new and welcome speaker at these conferences: "What God offers in Christ is precisely what the world is perishing for lack of: there is 'a famine of love throughout the world'; amid the warrings of our time—racial, national, industrial—to labor this point about the world's deepest need would be to thresh straw. The ablest and most far-seeing minds all over the world are saying that we have to discover the way of reconciliation between men or our civilization will collapse: it cannot survive otherwise."

* * *

Presenting a Complex World

It was a complex world which was expounded. But the more complex it is, the more it needs personal character. In other conferences the world is divided into Christian and non-Christian lands; and the fields of missionary work are taken one by one. It is true that the conference at Liverpool was missionary to the core and in many groups and sections the claims of service overseas were made known. But it is significant that the first concern was for the character of the message and the messenger. In the main assembly the three addresses bearing upon the world situation were these: one by Mr. J. H. Oldham, on "The Call to the Missionary," one by Dr. T. Z. Koo on "The Remaking of China," and the third by Mr. C. F. Andrews on "Racial Relationships." That the world is one mission field was the thought which underlay all the calls of the conference.

* * *

Outstanding Speeches

It would be possible to write long upon the address by Mr. Koo. What Briton could talk to the Chinese *in Chinese* upon British affairs as he talked to us *in English* upon China? The consummate mastery of the situation which he displayed fascinated every hearer. Mr. C. F. Andrews spoke like a prophet on racial matters. He had both the wrath of the prophet, and the prophet's indifference to the other side of the case. But no one will forget his call to the bearing of the Cross which must be taken by those who would deal with deep-seated racial antagonisms. "Were you there when they crucified my Lord?" When the speaker said those words those of us who knew what Charles Andrews has done, could understand; others might not. Into that world where racial bitterness is to be found, the friends of God must go.

* * *

Statistics of the Movement

A few personal facts may be interjected here. There were in all about 1,985 members of the conference. The chairman was R. O. Hall, author of "China and Britain." The well-beloved "T" (Canon Tatlow) was at the helm in his part of secretary. It was the fourth conference to be held at Liverpool—1896, 1908, 1912 and 1929. There are 200 branches of the Student movement in this country; in the world there are 350,000 members. During the years since the Student Volunteer movement began, 15,000 volunteers have sailed overseas. Of the students of Great Britain and Ireland 1 in 6 is a member.

* * *

Archbishop of York for Free Thought

To return to Liverpool. Towards the end of the conference the archbishop of York made his first appearance as archbishop in our midst—and gave two addresses—one on "The Dedication of Mind," and the other on "God's Purpose Through the Church." A passage will help to carry the reader into the heart of the first of these masterly addresses, which did much to complete the message: "Similarly we need, and more than all else we need, Christian philosophers—men who will work out the whole Christian world-view, having full regard alike to the revelation in Christ and to the facts of experience and the currents of contemporary thought. And here especially we must frankly recognize the reality of risk. For if such thinking is not truly free, it will be valueless; and if it is free it may tend to conclusions that are regretted. We must solemnly recognize that loss of faith may be the price that has to be paid for the ultimate winning of deeper truth, just as the sense of dereliction by God was part of what Christ must pass through to win the joy that was set before him, the joy of a world by him redeemed from selfishness to love."

* * *

The Friends Of God

"Liverpool 1929" is over; and yet has but begun. It will be written in all that follows the lives of those who in this glorious age go forth to live the life of the friends of God. But there were many who went forth in peace and joy and a humble confidence. One day Canon Head, as he spoke of the greater opportunities which awaited this generation, said, "I wish I were a young man again."

EDWARD SHILLITO.

submitted to him before publication, as was agreed upon when the interview was granted.

Presbyterian Men's Convention Held at Indianapolis

The seventh Presbyterian men's convention was held in First Presbyterian church, Indianapolis, Jan. 22. Among the speakers were Dr. Norman E. Richardson, on "Men and Their Vital Interests," Dr. W. C. Covert, on "Men and Religion in Education" and Rev. Joseph M. Broady, on "Men and Personal Evangelism."

Layman's Will Provides for Methodist Hospital

By the will of the late William Conroy, a layman of Calvary Methodist church, Pittsburgh, a sum of $500,000 is left for the building of a hospital at Mount Lebanon, near Pittsburgh, to be known as the Methodist Episcopal hospital. Calvary church also receives $100,000 for endowment.

Rev. E. M. Noyes Retires After 35-Year Ministry in One Church

Founded in 1664, and now 265 years old, First Congregational church, Newton, Mass., has had but ten ministers. The tenth, Rev. Edward M. Noyes, has just handed in his resignation, to take effect

Special Correspondence from Canada

Toronto, January 18.

DELEGATES from the United States have been in conference with representatives of the Canadian government concerning the prevention of smuggling of liquor into the United States from Canadian ports. It is important to recognize that the Canadians in this conference were not political or executive heads authorized to formulate or initiate government policy. They were rather responsible expert advisers of government, and at their head was Dr. Oscar Skelton, deputy minister for external affairs. Dr. Skelton is universally respected as one of the most high-minded and capable men in the public life of Canada, and normally attends the council of the league of nations in the Canadian delegation. Should the political authorities adopt a given policy it will be for him to work out the program; but the political decision rests with the political heads. They in turn are deeply involved in a most intricate tangle of interests and antipathies.

Rum Runners and Bootlegging

* * *

Water Power and Politics

Just at this moment Canadians are facing issues of enormous significance growing out of our international relations. The opening up of a deep sea route through the St. Lawrence and the great lakes has been considered by an international commission, and now the time has come for decision. That part of the St. Lawrence which is an international channel separates Ontario from New York. The lower part of the course lies exclusively in Quebec. Now Ontario is devoted to public ownership of water power and electric service, while Quebec is just as ardently devoted to private development. Quebec views with deep misgiving the growing Americanization of important industries in Canada, and is reluctant to assent to any plan which, by acknowledging international control over the whole St. Lawrence route, would, as they see it, mortgage the family heritage. Champions of other plans for the development of power on the St. Lawrence above Montreal have now joined in a fight against the projected international scheme and the fight behind the scenes at the Canadian capital is intense.

* * *

The Political Tangle

This conflict over water power in relation to the United States has reached the acute stage just when our neighbor asks for some adjustment of trading arrangements at the border. Quebec is positively unfriendly to any form of national prohibition; while in Ontario a very large proportion of the population, while disappointed with the partial failure of the attempt to secure prohibition, is strongly in favor of temperance and is unwilling to see Canada doing unfriendly acts to the republic. Again the conflict is intensified. But we must see how these various factors are linked together. For several years the smuggling of liquor into Canada was carried on on a gigantic scale, and the great distillers have recently been exposed and compelled to pay up. But there is an intimate relation between names on that list of defaulters and names prominent in the organization of the political party which now governs Canada. How many elements of influence can a government safely defy at once? This question becomes more important when one remembers that the government has its major electoral strength in the province of Quebec. While the rest of its strength is derived from the western prairie where opinion on all the issues mentioned is opposed to that of Quebec, Quebec is the major power, and Quebec rejects sympathy with prohibition, resists any progress to public ownership of water power, and distrusts any growth of American control in Canadian industry. What the liberal government can or will do in such a position no one can say.

* * *

The New Proposals

The house of commons under the lead of the present prime minister pledged itself to carry into effect the recommendations of a royal commission which exposed the wholesale irregularities above referred to. One of these proposals is to refuse to give clearance papers to vessels leaving Canadian ports with liquor for United States territory. In support of this proposal public bodies in great numbers have been speaking. But those behind the scenes are not sure that the project would be effective. Much if not most of the liquor shipped to the United States is carried on comparatively small motor boats which do not leave any recognized port or go to any such port. They sail from and to some small wharf away from any center, and motor cars attend at each end. But large quantities of the liquor shipped ostensibly for the United States ports are destined never to quench American thirst. Secretly brought back to secluded spots along the river or the lakes, the liquor is sold in Canadian communities, notwithstanding the claim that government sale would stop all the demand for the bootlegged liquor. Only a few months ago the Ontario Liquor Control board had to find a new chairman, its first head staying with the job only for a year; and now the press is preparing us for another resignation of the new chairman. Yet Sir Henry Drayton, the present chairman, has been making a strenuous effort to cope with the illegal manipulations of liquor. The truth appears to be that the customs service has so long been tampered with that confidence is seriously weakened. Nor can Canadians feel sure that the men in charge on the other side actually wish the irregularities to cease. When Canadians offered to report immediately the departure of cargoes of liquor probably for American ports a short experience soon elicited a proposal from the American authorities to send such information not at the time but in fortnightly bulletins. Could anything reveal more completely the hollowness of the whole thing?

* * *

Why Canadians Hesitate

If, therefore, American friends should find some Canadians hesitant about pledging themselves to particular projects for stopping the traffic, it may be well to know that many ardent friends of the Volstead act in Canada are quite unconvinced that the methods now most advocated are anything but illusions. A higher morale in the public services and in the railway services along the border territories, and a surer confidence between the officers and governments that on both sides there is stern intention to make the law effective would do much to improve matters. There is much to be done by Mr. Hoover's new commission.

ERNEST THOMAS.

No bookstore *handy* to you?

ANY book you want to buy can be bought from the—

Christian Century BOOK SERVICE
440 South Dearborn Street
CHICAGO

Postage Prepaid - - - Cash or Charge
Participating Coupon - Prompt Service

Oct. 1. Dr. Noyes began his work at Newton in 1894. He has built up a strong church by means of a vigorous teaching ministry. Dr. Noyes comes of a family of ministers: there have been several ministers in every generation of the family since 1634.

New Methodist Church For Milwaukee

The new Kenwood Methodist church, Milwaukee, Wis., which faces the campus of the State Teachers' college, is now in service, having been dedicated Dec. 30 by Bishops Locke and Waldorf. The total cost of the building and site stands at $267,000. Rev. E. C. Hickman is the Kenwood pastor.

Rev. D. C. MacLeod Called to St. Louis Presbyterian Leadership

Rev. Donald C. MacLeod, until recently minister of Dundee Presbyterian church, Omaha, Neb., and in earlier years minister at Central Presbyterian church, St. Louis, has been called as executive secretary of St. Louis presbytery, and began his work Jan. 1.

Chicago Office of Federal Council Extends Its Scope

The midwest office of the Federal council, located in the Chicago Temple, has recently enlarged its scope of activities. It is now under the general direction of a committee of laymen and church leaders, of which Dean Shailer Mathews is chairman; Dr. John M. Moore, one of the secretaries of the council, will spend part of each year in Chicago territory, with the office his headquarters; Rev. Perry J. Rice, who has served the midwest committee for some years, continues in immediate charge of the office and in addition has assumed responsibility for the promotion of interchurch cooperation in the smaller cities of the midwest territory. Other general secretaries of the council will spend some time each year at the Chicago headquarters.

Archbishop of Melbourne, Australia, Dies

Rev. Harrington C. Lees, Anglican archbishop of Melbourne, Australia, dropped dead Jan. 10. He was 58 years of age. Dr. Lees had served as archbishop of Melbourne and metropolitan of Victoria since 1921. He served in South American parishes for a time.

Rev. C. G. Clarke Begins Work at Chicago Congregational Church

Rev. Clement G. Clarke, who has recently come from the Congregational church of Portland, Ore., to assume pastoral duties at the Austin (Chicago) Congregational church, preached his first sermons in Austin Dec. 30. Dr. Clarke spent nine years at Yale university and won many honors as an orator and debater while there.

Massachusetts Congregational Leaders Meet Next Week

Among the speakers at the convocation of Massachusetts Congregational ministers, to be held at Worcester Feb. 4 to 6, are Prof. W. E. Hocking of Harvard, Prof. Frank C. Porter of Yale, and Prof. D. J. Fleming of Union, Rev. A. W. Bevan, Rev. C. C. Merrill, Rev. Herbert W. Gates, Rev. F. E. Brownlee, Rev. F. E. Emrich and Rev. Benjamin Willmott. The spirit of the convocation will be "devotional and inspirational."

Dr. Soper to Be Inaugurated Next Month

Thursday and Friday, Feb. 14, 15, are the dates set for the exercises in connection with the inauguration of Dr. Edmund

METHODS OF PRIVATE RELIGIOUS LIVING

By HENRY M. WIEMAN

Here are setting up exercises for keeping heart, will and soul toned up. Divers tests have demonstrated that their use produces definite observable improvement in poise and power. They have sometimes shown themselves helpful to a startling degree. Based on the astonishing recent finds in contemporary philosophy which Wieman has thoroughly mastered.

"Warmly to be commended for its guidance in thinking through the technique of an effective religious life."—*Harry Emerson Fosdick.* Price $1.75

Without a Rival and Up to the Minute

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

Including the Apocrypha

1624 pages—1,200,000 words—Price $5.00

Edited by BISHOP GORE

The college trained clergyman will find this Gore Commentary the quickest, handiest answer to Bible points cropping up in his reading and sermonizing on which he wishes "to make sure he is right."

The young clergyman will find himself consulting and reviewing it oftener than any of his books other than the Bible itself.

Bible-loving layman will take untold hours of delight in assimilating its prodigious contents.

Suggestion to Presidents of Parish Women's Organizations: Vote to present your Pastor a copy at your next meeting. 1624 Pages, 1,200,000 words—Price $5.00

Victim and Victor
By John Rathbone Oliver
Author of "Fear"

"Some of the chapters are so realistic, so true to life, so weird and so probe the human mind to the bottom that only a psychiatrist who happened also to be a literary artist could have written them."—*Watchman-Examiner.*

"This VICTIM AND VICTOR is as unmistakable as incense. He has about him the dignity of the liturgy he loves. He shines."—*New York Evening Post.* Price $2.50

The Graphic Bible
By Lewis Browne

"The book is a marvel of compression. I do not see how so much information has been packed in so small space."—*Francis J. McConnell, Bishop, No. M. E. Church.* Price $2.50

A History of Christian Missions in China
By Kenneth S. Latourette
Author of "The Development of Japan," etc.

Christianity in China complete in one well documented volume.

An invaluable aid to all who wish to understand the history of China during the last one hundred and fifty years, and especially Western intercourse with China down to 1927. The standard indispensable book in its field for all those actively engaged or interested in Christian missions. Over 900 pages. Price $5.00

Developing Personality in Boys
By W. Ryland Boorman

Program and curriculum are thought of as belonging to the zone of interaction between the individual and his social setting and the criterion of success is the extent and character of the socialization and the growth in personal force. Price $2.50

Morality in the Making
By Roy E. Whitney

What the personnel manager of a big corporation with thousands of employees has learned about "how to read character."

For those who daily deal with human nature as doctors, teachers, lawyers, managers, foremen, parents, social workers, etc. Price $1.50

The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church
By Dr. Kaufmann Kohler
Author of "Jewish Theology"

Shows how the free churches trace their descent in a direct line from the ancient synagogue, housing as it did both the first week day public school and democratically conducted institution for public worship on the Sabbath. Price $3.00

The Psychology of Religious Awakening
By Elmer T. Clark, S.T.D., L.L.D.

The only work in twenty-five years to apply sufficiently large masses of statistical data to form sound inferences concerning how young men and women react to the conversion experience today. Probable price $2.00

Tongues of Fire
A Bible Composed of Sacred Scriptures of the Pagan World
Compiled by Grace H. Turnbull

Here is sufficient first-hand data from which to form your own opinion as to the highest peaks of thought and God-ward aspiration reached by the prophets, priests, philosophers and poets of antiquity. Makes a fine sequel for readers of "This Believing World." Probable price $3.50

Frankness in Religion
By Robert J. Hutcheon

Can it be shown that man is a religion maker and user in the same way he is a language maker and user? By those willing "to think things through," yes answers this book. Probable price $2.50

Sacraments
By A. L. Lilley

"Theology is the most intelligent opinion of itself that religion can form" is the proposition expounded here and the general doctrine of the sacrament is drawn on as the field of illustration. Price $1.50

Moral Adventure
By Canon B. H. Streeter
(Reprinted from "Adventure")

This section of the larger work edited by Canon Streeter entitled "Adventure" is now published separately in reply to a widespread demand that its exceptionally illuminating treatment in the judgment of these petitioners of the Ethics of Sex be made available at a lower price. Probable price $1.25

The Ambassador
By Bishop James E. Freeman
Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1928

Does not find fault with people for changing, but proceeds at once to grapple with the problems of how Christian churches and ministers should change their ways and methods to correspond. Price $2.00

Facing Life
By W. H. P. Faunce

"Packed with so much sound sense, literary merit and understanding of student problems that—well, you fellows ought to read them."—*The Intercollegian.*

In big demand by school principals. Price $2.00

At your bookstore or from

60 FIFTH AVENUE **THE MACMILLAN COMPANY** NEW YORK CITY

Chicago Boston Atlanta Dallas San Francisco

Pulpit and Choir GOWNS

Embroidered Pulpit Hangings, Bookmarkers, Fabrics, etc.

Custom Tailoring for Clergymen

Specialists in Church Vestments and Embroideries for Half a Century

Write for Special Offer for Early Season Orders.

COX SONS & VINING, Inc.
131-133 EAST 23rd STREET NEW YORK

Church Furniture
Globecraft Shops
Since 1876
Fine church furniture, moderately priced. *Tell us your needs.* Before you buy—*compare!*
Globe Furniture Mfg. Co.
18 Park Place — Northville, Mich.

Aids on
Lincoln Sermons

Life of Lincoln, Barton, $4.00.
Life of Lincoln, Beveridge, $12.50.
The Prairie Years, Sandburg, $10.00.
Lincoln and Others (poems), T. C. Clark, $1.50.
Quotable Poems, Clark-Gillespie (9 Lincoln poems), $2.50.

Christian Century Book Service
440 S. Dearborn St. :: Chicago

Devotional Books
of B. HERMAN

The work of Mrs. Herman stands at the forefront in devotional literature. The late Dr Jowett pronounced her early books the "best of their kind."

Mrs. Herman's Best Books

The Touch of God

Thirty chapters on such themes as: "The Hidden Spring," "The Grace of Wonder," "The Strength of the Hills," "The Shepherd Heart," "The Uplands of God," "Perils in the Desert," "The Fire on the Beach," "The Treasure of Toil," "The Sacrament of Friendship." To ministers: Let these chapters suggest themes for your Lenten preaching. To laymen: if the springs of your spiritual life are drying up this book will be a godsend to you. ($1.50)

The Secret Garden of the Soul

This book deals with the many aspects of the moral and spiritual life, its secret resources, its vicissitudes and temptations, the darknesses that hover over it, the revelations that shine upon it ($2 00)

Creative Prayer

The most helpful volume in many years on this much disputed subject. A remarkable revelation of the power of prayer in Christian experience. ($2 00)

We pay postage

Christian Century Book Service

D. Soper as president of Ohio Wesleyan university, Delaware, O. On Feb. 14 will be held an educational conference, and the following leaders will speak: Dean L. A. Weigle, of Yale, on "What Is a Christian College?" Dean Raymond Kent, of North-

Special Correspondence from Kentucky

Louisville, January 16.

SIXTY Louisville ministers, pastors of the various Protestant churches of the city, motored to a small country church 15 miles from the city on the first Monday of the new year and spent the day in quiet retreat. The retreat was sponsored by the Louisville council of churches and was conducted by Bishop Charles Woodcock, of the Episcopal diocese of Kentucky. Bishop Woodcock spoke for two hours in the morning and for one and one-half hours in the afternoon. His messages were designed to provoke soul searching and they accomplished that for which they had been designed. He pointed out the opportunities and privileges enjoyed by the minister and some of the dangers that confront him as a man. The bishop is older in years and in experience than most of the men who sat at his feet. He talked to us out of the rich fund of his experience. He chided, admonished and encouraged as a father speaking to his children.

Open Year with Retreat

* * *

Veteran Lutheran Minister Dies

Rev. Harlan K. Fenner, a Lutheran minister, has died after more than 56 years in the pastorate. Fifty-one of those years were spent as the pastor of a single congregation, that of the Second English Lutheran church of this city. He was called to the pastorate of this church in 1877, when the active membership numbered 19. He left it with an active membership of more than 500. In addition to his work at the Second church, Dr. Fenner organized two other churches in the city which now have a combined membership of more than 600. He served the general synod of the United Lutheran church for eight years; two years as president and six years as secretary. He was a director of Wittenburg college for more than forty years. Rev. Frank O. Taafel will succeed Dr. Fenner. Mr. Taafel comes to Louisville from a fruitful ministry in Fort Wayne, Ind.

* * *

Church Promotes Work For Unemployed

Dr. John Lowe Fort, pastor of the Trinity Methodist church, is a confirmed believer in the slogan, "A man who is willing to work has a just claim upon society for a chance to work." He has done his share in making this chance possible. In 1926 he started the Louisville Goodwill industries in the basement of Trinity church. He reported the progress of the undertaking to the Louisville ministers from time to time and received some cooperation, but most of the work was done by Dr. Fort. He made appeals to the public from time to time for cast off clothing and old worn out furniture. Dr. Fort took advantage of the recent holiday spirit to acquaint Louisville citizens with the work of the industries. This acquaintanceship was an eye-opener for most of us. Cripples and the handicapped are employed to repair the clothing, furniture and whatnots that come into the industry. The repaired products are placed on sale and the proceeds from these sales paid out in wages to the employes. About $24,500 was paid out in wages last year. Two trained social workers have been employed to supervise this work. It has grown from one room in a basement to a five-story factory building. "The employes are not given charity, but a chance to work," said Dr. Fort. Only those who are in need and cannot find work elsewhere are employed. They are paid according to their personal needs and capacity for work.

* * *

Confer on Student Religion

Four older boys' conferences were held in Kentucky during the month of December under the auspices of the state Y. M. C. A. Two were for white boys and two for colored. They were held in different sections of the state and attended by more than 450 boys selected from various high schools. They spent three days in conference under the leadership of Christian business and professional men. "Whither Bound" was the general conference theme. A conference somewhat similar to these was held also for college and university students and faculty, with 96 students and 56 faculty members attending. "The Function of Religion on the Campus" was the theme; Dean Thomas W. Graham, of Oberlin, the principal speaker.

* * *

And So Forth

"Founders' Day" was celebrated at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary last Friday. One of the principal features of the celebration was the formal opening of the new Levering gymnasium. This building has been constructed recently at a cost of $75,000 and was a gift of Mr. Levering, of Baltimore. . . . Three congregations of the city have moved into new and more adequate buildings during the last two months: the Twenty-second and Walnut street Baptist church, the Prestonia Presbyterian church and the Beulah Presbyterian church. Two other churches have issued sketches, "How the New Church Will Look"—the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian and the Messick Memorial Methodist. The congregation of the West Broadway Methodist merged with the Messick congregation last fall. This made larger quarters necessary. . . . The board of bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion church met in Louisville last week for their semi-annual three-day conference. Reports on the drive for $250,000 for Livingston college, Salisbury, N. C., were considered. . . . The Sunday afternoon "Y" meetings are an institution in Louisville. They are attended by crowds of men and women every Sunday afternoon.

L. A. TAYLOR.

Looking Forward

THREE or FOUR "*Lay*" readers to each minister reader of The Christian Century!

THREE OR FOUR *lay* readers to each minister reader. It seems to us that this is a reasonable ratio of readers to look forward to attaining. We are thinking of *units* of readers, of one minister reader and of the possible three or four lay readers.

Three or four lay readers to each minister reader—who are they? Who are these likely additional men and women readers of THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY?

The Christian Century,
440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago.

☐ Will you enter my name for a (new) 3 months ACQUAINTANCE subscription for $1.00 (enclosed).

☐ I am sending you....new subscriptions—enclosed, $4.00 a year; ministers, $3.00.

☐ Enclosed are names to receive sample copies of The Christian Century.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

western university, on "The Curriculum of a Christian College," and Bishop Francis J. McConnell, on "Christianity and Science in Modern Education." At the inaugural exercises, the following day, Bishops Hughes, Henderson, Welch and McDowell will be present, and have part on the program. The new president will give an address on "Academic Freedom in a Christian College."

Manchester, N. H. Plans Evangelistic Campaign

A tabernacle is being erected in Manchester, N. H., seating 2,000, for use during a six weeks' religious crusade to be conducted by Evangelist George W. Anderson, beginning Feb. 3.

The Late Dr. Simon P. Long Was a Popular Lecturer

Rev. Simon P. Long, pastor of Wicker Park Lutheran church, Chicago, who died suddenly in his church office early this month, was a popular lecturer, having given addresses in every state of the union. He was also a builder of congregations, one of his outstanding achievements being the development of a Mansfield, O., church to which he ministered to a membership of 2,000. He served as president of Lima college from 1898 to 1903.

Miss Royden Returns to London

Miss Maude Royden was due to return to London from her world tour two weeks ago, and is expected to resume her ministry at Eccleston Guildhouse early in February. During her absence of a year, the work of her church has gone along without a break. Many well-known ministers, Anglican and Free church, have preached at the Sunday services.

Makes Large Gift for Santiago College

Dr. R. E. Diffendorfer, of the Methodist board of foreign missions, reports that a gift of $150,000 for a new building and equipment for Santiago college, Santiago, Chile, has been made by Mr. and Mrs. Migel, of New York city. The gift is intended as a means of "kindlier mutual understanding, making toward peace and security between the Latin Americas and ourselves." The gift is conditioned upon the securing of a like amount for the college by the mission board during 1929.

Presbyterian Mission Receipts Fall Off

The Presbyterian reports that the total receipts of the board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian church from living donors, on Dec. 1, toward the budget of $4,323,701, authorized at the beginning of the fiscal year, were $1,415,968. This is said to represent a falling off of $24,517 from the receipts on Dec. 1, 1927. During

Correspondence from the Pacific Northwest

Portland, January 15.

THE dedication of the Laurelhurst Christian church in Portland on Jan. 6 is interesting as showing that while the institutions of religion are slow in starting, they are sure of arriving. Eight years ago, when the writer came to live in Laurelhurst, there was no Protestant church within easy walking distance, and all deeds of lots sold contained clauses prohibiting the erection of churches as well as of certain other types of buildings. A small frame Roman Catholic chapel, presumably erected in defiance or evasion of these restrictions, was the sole facility offered for religion. In the years since a Presbyterian church has moved up to one corner of the tract, a United Presbyterian congregation to the corner diagonally opposite, a Christian Science church has purchased lots in the subdivision, attacked the restrictive rules in the courts and won out, and now the Christian church has built within the territory named. These four churches have cost not less than one-third of a million dollars, and they offer to a populous community all needed facilities for worship, religious education, and social life. The latest structure cost fifty thousand dollars, has a seating capacity of 650, is equipped with a pipe organ, and possesses a dining room that will accommodate 300. Rev. Arthur Eaton is pastor. Three of the four churches have had a previous existence elsewhere and have moved in order to be nearer the homes of their membership. However, the increasingly transient population in the sections they left is being served adequately by religious agencies which are still operating in their midst.

The Churches Catch Up

* * *

Y. M. C. A. Annual Meetings

Mr. Charles P. Taft II of Cincinnati, a member of the National Y. M. C. A. board, has been touring the Pacific coast and addressing great convocations of the members of the organization, their families and friends. The Y occupies an important place in Pacific Northwest life. In both Seattle and Portland the value of its properties will touch the million-dollar mark and the annual budget will run to about a third of that amount. The Portland association emphasizes education and enrols more than 1000 students in its schools. It spends more than $80,000 a year for this purpose. The Seattle organization does much community work and pays special attention to sailors from the navy and merchant marine. It contemplates a campaign next month for $1,250,000 that is needed for expansion. The general secretaries—Arn S. Allen in Seattle, and Harry W. Stone in Portland—have occupied their present positions for more than 30 years and have come to possess unusual knowledge of local people and conditions.

* * *

And So Forth

Dr. G. Campbell Morgan is announced to deliver a series of Bible lectures in Portland March 25 to 29. His visit is sponsored by Dr. John Marvin Dean, president of the Western Baptist theological seminary. . . . The Japanese Buddhist church of Portland recently celebrated its 25th anniversary. A large crowd watched the quaint procession passing through the streets. Seattle has a much larger Japanese population, and in that respect is second only to Los Angeles in the United States. The leading theater in that city for two days in December presented the "foremost artists of Japan" in a dramatic offering. Flourishing congregations of Christian Japanese are maintained by the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians. . . . Spokane entertained an Epworth league assembly for the four states of the Pacific Northwest Jan. 4 to 6. It was one of those being held throughout the country in which national leaders are seeking to learn the mind of their local constituents regarding the future program of the organization. . . . A large majority of our leading churches and churchmen have asked the senate to ratify the Kellogg peace pact and to defeat the big cruiser bill. . . . The Congregational preachers of Oregon held their annual convocation at Pacific university, Forest Grove, Dec. 26 to 28. Speakers from outside the state were Dr. Hugh Dobson of Vancouver, B. C., and Professor William R. Davis of Whitman college. . . . Methodist circles in Oregon feel deeply the loss of Dr. Paul E. Edwards, the very successful pastor of Sunnyside church, Portland, who died Dec. 29. He was the son of a Methodist preacher in Indiana, and leaves three brothers who are in the ministry. . . . The congregation of Temple Emanuel of Spokane dedicated a beautiful and costly edifice Dec. 23. The afternoon service was a broad gauge affair and attracted much local attention. Prayer was offered by the pastor of the First Presbyterian church. The benediction was pronounced by the pastor of the Church of Truth, and two of the four addresses were delivered by the resident Episcopal bishop and the pastor of the Unitarian church.

EDWARD LAIRD MILLS.

"Copeland Smith at the Microphone"

For ministers who are pastors as well as preachers
For laymen who have problems

STRAIGHT ANSWERS TO LIFE QUESTIONS

Dr. Smith has answered 15,000 problem-letters in the past few months. He is a great radio pastor.

"Offers an interesting cross-section of problems that *are* bothering folks in their every day religious, family, business and other relations." $1.50

Christian Century Book Service, 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago

this same period there was received for new property and other special purposes $191,575, as compared with $143,623 a year ago. This increase of special gifts is attributed largely to the very generous gift of one man for medical work.

Chicago Theological "Players" Present Plays

The "Seminary players," which is the name of the drama club of the Chicago theological seminary, are now presenting in several Chicago churches Kenneth Sawyer Goodman's "Dust of the Road." The players produced their one-act drama, "Milk," and "Dust of the Road" successfully on Sunday evening, Dec. 16, at Dundee, Ill., under the auspices of the Dundee Sunday Evening club.

Detroit Presbyterians Have Many New Churches

Dr. M. C. Pearson, secretary of the Presbyterian board of extensions in Detroit, reports that the Presbyterians of that city are rejoicing over record achievements during 1929. Several new locations for churches have been secured, a number of new buildings have been erected and some of the older churches have made additions to their equipment during the year.

Presbyterians to Meet in Unity Conferences

The Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A., through its department of church cooperation and union, Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, chairman, will participate in a conference at Pittsburgh this week, attended by its own representatives and official representatives of the Methodist church. The conference was called at the request of the latter denomination. A conference will be held at Richmond, Va., March 8, between the Presbyterian church of the U. S. A. unity department and official representatives of the Southern Presbyterian church; the Southern general assembly calling the conference. It is hoped that steps toward mergers will be taken at both these meetings. At the Presbyterian general assembly held in Tulsa, Okla., last May, a suggestion from the general conference of the Methodist church proposed a merger with the Presbyterian church in the U. S. A.

Harmon Foundation Honors Chicago Minister

The Harmon foundation, of New York, gave one of its 1928 awards to Rev. L. K. Williams, pastor of Olivet Baptist church, (colored) Chicago. The awards of the foundation, administered by the commission on race relations of the Federal council, recognize "achievement which is of national significance and which measures favorably with the best that has been done in the particular field by any race or nationality."

FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE

(*Continued from page* 174)

four treaties awaiting senate ratification that deal with traffic in liquor, arms, and human beings in Africa and other parts of the world. The body broke into hearty applause upon announcement that the Kellogg-Briand peace pact had been ratified, and the next day paused in a prayer of gratitude at the moment of the White House ceremony for affixing signatures. Remarks and prayers alike avoided any reference to the navy bill, although its possible effects upon foreign mission work must have been obvious to all. The closing address by Dr. Endicott, formerly moderator of the United Church in Canada, made the conference aware that gray hairs are no indication of old age. He asserted that the world was less afraid of African heathenism than of American secularization and suggested "John Brown's Body" as a timely mission study book. . . . . The treasurer reported a balance in the treasury of $25.29.

CARLETON LACY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Spanish Summer, by George Craig Stewart. Morehouse Pub. Co., $2.50.
The Hour of Prayer, by George W. Phillips. Tenth Avenue Baptist Church, Oakland, Calif.
The Riddle of Life, by Neville S. Talbot. Longmans, $1.00.
One Thousand Sayings of History, by Walter Fogg. Beacon Press, $5.00.
From Abraham to Christ, by Vernon F. Scott. Doubleday, Doran, $2.50.
The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, by Arthur F. Taylor. Doubleday, Doran, $2.00.
Feathers on the Moor, Forty-two Expositions, by Archibald Alexander. Doubleday, Doran, $2.00.
Themes for Vital Preaching, a Book of References and Suggestions, compiled by Carl Betz and Paul Krutzky. Doubleday, Doran, $2.00.
Liberty in the Modern World, by George Bryan Logan, Jr. University of North Carolina Press, $2.00.
Paul and the Intellectuals, Stone Lectures for 1926, by A. T. Robertson. Doubleday, Doran, $2.00.
The Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics, selected by Francis T. Palgrave. New edition, with 200 additional poems. Macmillan, $2.00.
Humanism and Christianity, by Francis J. McConnell. Macmillan, $1.75.
Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, by Albert W. Beaven. Judson Press, $1.25.
Religious Difficulties of Youth, by A. D. Belden. Cokesbury, $1.50.
The Great Galilean, by Robert Keable. Little, Brown & Co., $2.50.
Sacraments, by A. L. Lilley. Macmillan, $1.50.
Jeremiah, His Time and His Work, by Adam C. Welch. Oxford University Press, $2.50.
Seven Dramatic Services of Worship. Methodist Book Concern.
An Italian Holiday, by Paul Wilstach. Bobbs, Merrill, $4.00
The Pilgrim's Progress, a Dramatic Version, by Wilton Rix. Appleton, $1.25.
Poems, by Anne Countess of Winchilsea, 1660-1720. Selected by John Middleton Murry. Harpers.
This Side of Jordan, by Roark Bradford. Harpers, $2.50.
Earthbound and Other Poems, by Helene Mullins. Harpers, $2.00.
Worlds Within Worlds, by Stella Benson. Harpers, $3.00.
The Disinherited, by Milton Waldman. Longmans, $2.00.
A Great Man, by Walter Vogdes. Longmans, $2.00.
The Chosen People, by Jerome and Jean Tharaud. Longmans, $2.00.

Send Us Your Name

and address, asking that you be enrolled on our Book Service Information List. You will receive all circulars, special bargain lists, etc.

Christian Century Book Serivce
440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago

The two best international uniform
LESSON ANNUALS

Tarbell's Guide
By Martha Tarbell
($1.00)

Snowden's Sunday School Lessons
By James H. Snowden
($1.50)

Christian Century Book Service
440 S. Dearborn St. Chicago

Contains the great hymns of the Church

Also the best of the modern hymns

HYMNS OF THE UNITED CHURCH

[Willett-Morrison]

One hundred pages of responsive Scripture readings and other Aids to Worship. The Readings are topically selected, and so arranged as to give naturalness to the responses. The American Standard Version is used. Orders of Worship, special forms for the communion service, and many prayers, responses and sentences topically arranged are in this department.

Ask for returnable copy and consider the adoption of this Hymnal before the Lenten season begins!

The Christian Century Press, 440 S. Dearborn St., Chicago

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE
WHITHER MANKIND
WHAT IS THE MIND?
The MAKING of the CHRISTIAN MIND
A Contour History of Christianity, by Gaius Glenn Atkins
the Word of God
KARL BARTH
Humanism Christianity

14 New Books You Should Know About

and what the critics are saying about them

The Making of the Christian Mind:

Gaius Glenn Atkins

"A strong book. Dr. Atkins has given his readers a new and fascinating insight into church history. The book is an excellent analysis and interpretation of the forces that have combined to create the Christian mind. The author has succeeded amazingly well in giving us an interesting and reliable 'contour history of Christianity,' as he calls it." (Zion's Herald) *$3.*

Private Methods of Religious Living:

Henry Nelson Wieman

"This new book, along with his previous two volumes, gives Dr. Wieman foremost place as a modern interpreter of religion." (Charles Clayton Morrison) In this third book the author brings to the test of actual living his theories of religion. Dr. Edward Scribner Ames, Dr. Theodore G. Soares and other leaders in religious thought assisted Dr. Wieman in the preparation of his book. *$1.75.*

Motives of Men:

George A. Coe

"A frank and searching inquiry into the causes of that critical, cynical, disillusioned attitude toward mankind and life that is a characteristic of this present age . . . The author's purpose is to examine that area of current life which has been affected by the modern mood of spiritual depression, to search for its causes and to try to find some means by which it can be cured." (New York Times) *$2.25.*

Humanism and Christianity:

Francis J. McConnell

"If I were asked by an intelligent man brought up in a foreign land, without contact with Christianity, what short book he might consult to find a picture of what Christianity means to a leader of the church in America, I should send him at once McConnell's 'Humanism and Christianity'." (H. E. B. Speight in the Christian Leader) *$1.75.*

What Is the Mind?

G. T. B. Patrick

Just from the press. Tells the story of man's changing idea of mind. Points out how the older views have gradually given way to the realization that mind is simply a term for certain operations and activities of the human organism as a whole. His position may be described as a constructive development of behaviorism. The implications of such an outlook for many traditional beliefs are obvious. Dr. Patrick is professor of philosophy in the University of Iowa. *$2.50.*

Jesus on Social Institutions:

Shailer Mathews

"The book is devoted to the teaching of Jesus as respects man's duty as a member of human society, and as such he is not to hold aloof from affairs, but to participate whole-heartedly in every phase of normal life. . . The pre-eminence of Jesus Christ is sustained throughout." (Christian Evangelist) *$1.50.*

The Master:

W. Russell Bowie

"A fresh interpretation of the personality which has challenged, inspired and yet perplexed and baffled men for so long. If only such a direct approach to the greatness of Jesus had been made by the church throughout the centuries! How different might have been the story of its endeavors and achievements!" (The Christian Leader) *$2.50.*

Affirmative Religion:

Winfred Ernest Garrison

"An open and honest effort to affirm a warm and working faith in the great verities of the Christian religion from the point of view of a modernist . . . The book will be helpful for the intelligent preacher who is thinking his way through the problems discussed in its pages. The big things in religion are handled reverently." (John A. Earl in The Baptist) *$2.*

Christian Century BOOK SERVICE

We keep you advised of the best in current books
12 years of book experience

We can supply any book now in print
Let us handle all your orders

14 New Books

(Continued)

The Humanity of God:

John W. Buckham

"This is not a surface book. Our pulp-press, embarrassing us with its vast overspill in worthless books, makes us grateful for such noble workmanship, enlightened conviction, close and reverent study of the profoundest reality we have. This is a book that brings deep comfort and warm nurture to our faith." (The Baptist) *$2.50.*

Whither Mankind:

17 Authorities

Edited by Charles A. Beard

"The ablest, most thoughtful, balanced and altogether most encouraging critical estimate of present-day civilization we have yet had. A work to inspire our time to new endeavors." (New York Sun) *$3.00.*

The Faith That Rebels:

D. S. Cairns

"Taking into account all that science and philosophy have to teach, the distinguished Scotch theologian still finds the miracles both credible and essential to the Christian view of God and the world. The prime conclusion is that, if we can really believe in a living personal God and in human freedom, there is very little of an intellectual case against the miracles." (Religious Book Club Bulletin) *$2.50.*

Cardinal Ideas of Jeremiah

Charles E. Jefferson

Dr. Jefferson believes that Jeremiah—not a "weeping prophet" but a robust statesman—has a message for these times. "When once understood, the prophets turn out to be thoroughly modern men, dealing with the same sort of social and religious problems with which Christian men today are grappling." *$2.00.*

The Word of God and the Word of Man:

Karl Barth

"A book that will make men think" (Zion's Herald). "I have been held as by a strong hand by Douglas Horton's translation of Barth's book." (Edward Shillito) "In its content, Barth's theology is strongly Calvinistic and strangely orthodox, but the principle of it the most left-winged humanism will apprehend and be carried to the heights by it." (The Christian Register) *$2.25.*

New Commentary on the Holy Scripture:

Canon Gore, Editor

"A book we have long been waiting for: a one-volume commentary on the whole Bible written by scholars who are loyal to the catholic tradition, modern in their critical methods, and in sympathy with the established conclusions of Biblical scholarship." (American Church Monthly) *$5.00.*

25 Other Recent Favorites

PREACHING VALUES, *Luccock.* $2.

CATHOLICISM AND THE AMERICAN MIND, *Garrison,* $2.50.

SCIENCE IN SEARCH OF GOD, *Mather,* $2.

QUOTABLE POEMS, *Clark-Gillespie,* $2.50.

FACING LIFE (TALKS TO YOUTH), *Faunce,* $2

THE SON OF MAN, *Ludwig,* $3.

THE NEW QUEST, *Jones,* $1.75.

CREDENTIALS OF THE CHURCH, *Davis,* $1.25.

THE CASE FOR CHRISTIANITY, *Rogers,* $3.

TINKER AND THINKER: JOHN BUNYAN, *Nelson,* $1.50.

ALTAR STAIRS (PRAYERS), *Newton,* $1.75.

THE GRAPHIC BIBLE, *Browne,* $2.50.

STRAIGHT ANSWERS TO LIFE QUESTIONS, *Smith,* $1.50.

THE PARABLES OF JESUS, *Buttrick,* $2.50.

CREATION BY EVOLUTION, *16 Scientists,* $5.

THE STREAM OF HISTORY, *Parsons,* $5.

IF I HAD ONLY ONE SERMON TO PREACH: *Eng. Series,* $2.50.

PROTESTANTISM, *Inge,* 75 cents.

MODERN RELIGIOUS DRAMAS, *Eastman,* $3.

CHRISTIANITY AND SUCCESS, *Hughes,* $1.50.

CHRIST AT THE ROUND TABLE, *Jones,* $1.50.

PRESENT-DAY DILEMMAS IN RELIGION, *Gilkey,* $1.50.

BELIEFS THAT MATTER, *Brown,* $2.75.

SHODDY, *Brummitt,* $2.

CHRIST AND SOCIETY, *Gore,* $2.

CHRISTIAN CENTURY BOOK SERVICE,
440 So. Dearborn Street, Chicago. Send me:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

My Name .....
(Print Name Plainly)

Address .....

☐Cash..... ☐Credit .....

books of definite achievement

QUOTABLE POEMS

Steadily maintains its "best seller" position in the religious bookstores of the country. This anthology compiled by Clark and Gillespie contains the selected inspirational verse of 300 poets. There are 4 indexes. $2.50

CATHOLICISM AND THE AMERICAN MIND

by Winfred Ernest Garrison, will stand for years as an enlightening, well balanced, interesting survey of Roman Catholicism in Church and State. $2.50

SHODDY

by Dan Brummitt, is an absorbing novel with a purpose—a sort of looking glass in which churchmen may see their church system and watch their Bonafedes and Middletons at work. $2.00

THE OUTLAWRY OF WAR

by Charles Clayton Morrison, is the one authoritative interpretation of the outlawry movement. Recent peace developments give unusual importance to this comprehensive statement. $3.00

TINKER AND THINKER: JOHN BUNYAN

William Hamilton Nelson "makes John Bunyan walk and talk in our own day." And at the same time pictures with extraordinary vividness those exciting events of his own time in which the tinker took so active a part. $1.50

THE DRIFT OF THE DAY

Burris Jenkins gives a wholesome, straightforward summary of modern Christian thinking. Told in plain, intelligible, unaffected language. "It not only brings religion abreast of the times, but it demands the highest, and best in every man and challenges him to live up to it." $2.00

WHAT AND WHY IN CHINA

A spirited account by Paul Hutchinson, of the present situation in China, what lead up to it, and what it portends for the future. $1.00

PURSUIT OF THE FLYING BABY

was published in expectation of its becoming a classic in the field of stories for children. Already there are evidences that we guessed right. This story by Fred Eastman (of 237 pages, in large size type, and with 12 illustrations in color) is refreshingly original and splendidly executed. $2.00

WHITE PEAKS AND GREEN

is an exquisite gift volume of lyrical poems by Ethel Romig Fuller. Her poems embody the thrill of adventure, a feel of beauty, a tang of mountain air. In enchanting binding. $2.00

ORDER THROUGH YOUR BOOKSTORE OR FROM US

Willett, Clark & Colby—Publishers

440 South Dearborn Street, Chicago — 200 Fifth Avenue, New York